

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TURKS AND THE GENOESE, 1300-1453

KATHERINE HARRIET FLEET

THE SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES, UNIVERSITY  
OF LONDON

Submitted to the University of London for the degree of PhD,

November 1993



ProQuest Number: 11015927

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 11015927

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

## ABSTRACT

### TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TURKS AND THE GENOESE, 1300-1453

This thesis examines the trade relations between the Turks and the Genoese in the period 1300 to 1453. It has two aims, first to investigate the trade, examining the commodities involved and discussing the taxes levied upon it, and second to consider the role of Genoese capital and know-how in the economic development of the early Ottoman empire.

The thesis is based on archival material from the Genoese State Archives with other published Latin material, such as documents from the Venetian archives, and published Ottoman documents, together with some Byzantine and Arabic data. Several unpublished Genoese documents are included in an appendix to the thesis.

The introduction discusses the sources, concentrating on the data available in the Genoese archives. The importance of western archival material, such as that from Genoa, has perhaps been under-rated to date for Ottoman history of this period, one for which there is such a dearth of Turkish material.

Chapter one consists of a brief discussion of the monies used in this commerce.

Chapter two investigates the taxes levied on international trade and considers the importance of Genoese merchants in the tax farming system.

Chapter three deals with the commodities which were

imported and exported, concentrating specifically on slaves, grain, alum, cloth, metals and wine.

The thesis concludes with an evaluation of the significance of Turkish - Genoese trade in this period, and the importance of Genoese merchants in the early economic development of the Ottoman state.

There are two appendices containing documents and a glossary of names.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
INTRODUCTION	7
CHAPTER I	17
Money	
CHAPTER II	34
Taxes	
CHAPTER III	131
Commodities	
Section 1	Slaves 134
Section 2	Grain 177
Section 3	Alum 204
Section 4	Cloth 235
Section 5	Metals 272
Section 6	Wine 289
Section 7	Other Commodities 300
CONCLUSION	323
APPENDICES	328
1	Documents 329
2	Glossary of Names 380
ABBREVIATIONS	382
BIBLIOGRAPHY	383

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Miss Julian Chrysostomides, who has supervised my work with a meticulous rigour and constant attention for which I shall always be grateful. She has given hours, far beyond what could be expected of a supervisor, to work through my chapters, making me defend my arguments, and has always been there as a constant support. Not only did she train me in palaeography and teach me the methods necessary for research, but she showed me what true scholarship should be.

I should like to thank Dr Colin Heywood for his kindness and support, Dr Margaret Bainbridge for teaching me Turkish and Dr Uygur Kocabaşoğlu for his kindness in helping me with Ottoman. Dr Simonetta Calderini and Dr Delia Cortese have helped me with Italian queries and been a great support during the thesis. Dr Catherine Otten helped enormously when I first arrived in the Genoese archives and has since then been a constant source of information on Genoese palaeography and a supportive friend. I should like to thank in particular Dr Aslı Göksel, who has always rescued me in Turkish and whose friendship has kept me going.

I have received funds from various bodies for which I should like to express my thanks. The School of Oriental and African Studies awarded me a one year language scholarship to learn Turkish, the Economic and Social Research Council awarded me a three year studentship, the Central Fund of the University of London gave me a grant to work in the Genoese

archives, and I also received an award from the Skilliter Library, Newnham College, Cambridge.

I must also thank the staff of the Archivio di Stato di Genova and the staff of the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies. I should also like to thank the Skilliter Centre for Ottoman Studies and the Principal, Fellows and Members of Newnham College, Cambridge, in particular Lindsey Anderson-Gear, who has always been there in a crisis, and Dr Mary Heimann for her encouragement.

## INTRODUCTION

Any economic history of the late middle ages is handicapped by the nature, and scarcity, of the sources. This problem is accentuated when dealing with Turchia<sup>1</sup> in the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries by the great dearth of Turkish sources for the period. The extant data do not deal in general with economic activity, concerning themselves more with the bloodthirsty activities of the various rulers. It may be too strong to say that without western sources there would be no economic history of Turchia in this period, but it does make the point that no worth while research into this area can be done without using western archives such as those of the city states of Genoa and Venice.

This thesis therefore is an attempt to examine one aspect of Turkish economic life, that is, international trade between the Turks and the Genoese, in the period between the rise of the Turkish beyliks, among them the Ottomans, and the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II in 1453. The research is predominantly based on archival material from the state archives of Genoa. It was therefore inevitable that the development of the thesis was dictated by the information these sources revealed. While the original

---

<sup>1</sup> The word Turchia has been used throughout the thesis with the meaning that it has in western sources of, initially, Turkish-ruled Asia Minor, and, with Ottoman expansion, to include the most eastern area of Ottoman territory in Europe, roughly equivalent to that of the European section of the modern Turkish state. The term is useful as there is no modern equivalent.

intention was to concentrate on the trade in guns and slaves, although the <sup>Sources</sup> produced a wealth of information on the slave trade, the arms trade proved extremely elusive, not to say non-existent, in the Genoese documents. The material also dictated the geographical area to be investigated, namely western Anatolia, the southern coast of Asia Minor, the western coastal area of the Sea of Marmara and the Black Sea coast, <sup>where</sup> the Genoese were themselves active.

Using predominantly western sources, this study examines Turkish commerce with the Genoese and other western city states, what commodities made up this trade and how significant it was. Developing from this, the thesis aimed to consider what part, if any, the Genoese, or other western merchants, played in the economic development of the early Ottoman state. International trade was of great importance from the very beginnings of the Ottoman empire and the desire of Ottoman rulers to control international trade routes to a degree influenced their territorial expansion<sup>1</sup>. This thesis considers whether, apart from influencing territorial conquests, international trade and the presence of western merchants with their expertise and capital in Ottoman territories contributed economically in any way to the early

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Ottoman state, from its inception in the fourteenth century, sought to establish control over international trade routes. This consideration, in fact, largely determined the pattern of Ottoman territorial expansion", Huri İslamoğlu-İnan and Çağlar Keyder, *Agenda for Ottoman history in The Ottoman Empire and the World-Economy* ed. Huri İslamoğlu-İnan, (Cambridge, 1987), pp.50-51.

development and success of the Ottoman state<sup>1</sup>, and whether the Ottomans, as opposed to the other petty Turkish rulers in the fourteenth century, made use of western merchants' capital and known-how as a means of generating income for the state or in some way to contribute to its development.

The history of western Anatolia in the fourteenth century has been described by Suraiya Faruqi as a topic much used by research students for their theses because of the limited primary and secondary sources and the limited extension of the beyliks themselves. This lack of sources has, she says, acted as a challenge and "scholars have squeezed the last drop of information out of a few inscriptions, chronicles and occasional references in early Ottoman or Venetian documents<sup>2</sup>". In fact this does an injustice to the amount of material available.

The Genoese archives are a rich and largely un-mined source of material for this subject. There are problems in dealing with this source material, the most important of which concerns the cataloguing of the notary deeds, one of the most valuable sources for information on Turkish -

---

<sup>1</sup> Persian merchants, for example, were important in state formation in southern India in the seventeenth century, Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Intra-Asia Elite Movements and Tax-Farmers' Careers in 17th century Southern India*, paper read at the International Symposium on *The State, Decentralisation and Tax-Farming, 1500-1850: The Ottoman Empire, Iran and India* held at Munich 2-5 May 1990, referred to by Halil Berktaş, 'Three Empires and the Societies they Governed: Iran, India and the Ottoman Empire', in *New Approaches to State and Peasant in Ottoman History* ed. Halil Berktaş and Suraiya Faruqi (London, 1992), pp.248, 249.

<sup>2</sup> Suraiya Faruqi, 'In Search of Ottoman History', in *New Approaches to State and Peasant in Ottoman History* ed. Halil Berktaş and Suraiya Faruqi (London, 1992), pp.227-228.

Genoese trade. The catalogues for the notaries list one notary and one date while the *cartulare* (bound collections of deeds) themselves may contain deeds enacted by many different notaries at different dates and at different places of enactment, these remaining thus uncatalogued. It is not possible therefore to rely on the information in the catalogues when selecting which *cartulare* to consult for references to Turchia, and there is no alternative to wading through large quantities of irrelevant documents.

The following unpublished documents were consulted:

#### I ARCHIVIO DI STATO DI GENOVA

##### Notario, *cartulare*

C.20/I Giovanni Veggio

C.101 Guilielmus de Cendata

C.105 Vivaldus de Sarzana, Antonius de Quarto,

C.120/I Simonis de Albario

C.174 Antonius Feloni,

C.175 Antonius Feloni

C.229 Thomas de Casanova

C.235 Tommaso Casanova,

C.271 Domenico Ottone

C.296/I Georgius de Ponte de Framura

C.296/II Georgius de Ponte de Framura

C.317 Pellegrini Bracelli

C.318 Giovanni Ognibono et altri

C.381 Giovanni Bardi

C.385 Rafaele Cazanova  
C.411 Antonio de Credentia  
C.412 Giovanni Nole et Michele Bonaventura  
C.468/I Antonio Foglietta  
C.468/II Antonio Foglietta  
C.472 Johanis de Alegro  
C.473 Oberto Grassi di Voltri  
C.476 Donato de Clavaro  
C.478 Julianus Cannella  
C.586 (Sc.44 filza 12) Antonio Senior Fazio  
C.596 (Sc.46 filza 1) Giovanni de Recco  
C.765 Bernardo de Ferrari

#### **Notai Filze**

Sc.37 filza 1 Gregorio Panissario  
Sc.39 filza 1 Donato de Clavaro  
Sc.40 filza 1 Giovanni Labaino  
Sc.46 filza 1 Giovanni Balbi  
Sc.77 filza 1 Antonio Foglietta

#### **Notai Ignoti**

Notai Ignoti A  
Notai Ignoti B  
Notai Ignoti E  
Notai Ignoti E bis  
Notai Ignoti O  
Notai Ignoti VI  
Notai Ignoti XIV



Notai Ignoti XV

Notai Ignoti XVIII

Notai Ignoti XXI

Notai Ignoti 15

#### **Archivio di San Giorgio**

Caffa Massaria 1221 bis

Sala 34 590/1268 (Famagusta Massaria)

Sala 34 590/1304 (Peira Massaria)

Sala 34 590/1305 (Peira Massaria)

Sala 34 590/1306 (Peira Massaria)

Sala 34 590/1307 (Peira Massaria)

Sala 35, Cancellieri Gerolamo Spinula, 223/35

Sala 35, Cancellieri Gerolamo Spinula, 228

Sala 39 Busta 88

Manoscritti Membranacei 1V

Manoscritti Membranacei V

Manoscritti Membranacei VI

#### **Archivio Segretto**

3021 filza 1

#### **Archivio Segretto, Diversorum**

496, 497, 498, 499, 526, 247, 549, 550, 551, 552,  
553, 554, 555

#### **Archivio segreto, Materie Politiche**

2726, 2727, 2728, 2729, 2730, 2731, 2774 A, 2774  
C, 2774 D

## **Antico Comune**

83 (Magistrorum rationalium, 1388)

Communis Ianuae Massaria 16

Communis Ianuae Massaria 17

Communis Ianuae Massaria 18

Communis Ianuae Massaria 19

Communis Ianuae Massaria 20

Communis Ianuae Massaria 22

## **II ARCHIVIO DI STATO DI TORINO**

Il Viaggi di Levante, mazzo 1 d'addizione, docs.  
1-8,13,15.

Il Viaggi di Levante, mazzo 1, doc. 2. This  
document consists of the accounts of Antonio  
Barberis, treasurer of Count Amadeo VI of Savoy,  
for 1366-1368<sup>1</sup>

## **III CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE**

MS 66A, ff.67r-110r (William of Rubruck)

MS181, ff.321-398 (William of Rubruck)

Published primary sources have also been consulted.  
Apart from published Genoese material, both Venetian and

---

<sup>1</sup> In the handwritten summary to this document reference was made to Murad I. I was however unable to find any such reference in the text and it may therefore be that the reference to Murad I was in one of the folios (ff.1,2,51,53,108,109) which were sent to Naples for an exhibition and destroyed there in the second world war. The sources from the archives in Turin do not appear to contain information relevant to trade from the western city states into Turchia.

Florentine archival sources proved extremely useful<sup>1</sup>. Venice, in particular, with the treaties between Venetian Crete and the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın, the Senate's instructions to ambassadors, merchants letters and notary deeds provides invaluable information. Other published sources of particular importance are merchant handbooks and accounts, giving information on commodities traded, ports used, prices, weights and measures. Pegolotti is invaluable for the earlier fourteenth century while the account book of Giacomo Badoer, who was active in Constantinople in the later 1430s, is particularly useful, giving details of all his commercial activities, including expenses incurred when buying commodities in Ottoman territories.

Other western sources which give some information useful for trade include accounts of travellers, for example those of the Aragonese ambassador, Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo, who travelled through Anatolia on his way to the court Timur, and Bertrandon de la Broquière, who was in Ottoman territory in the 1430s.

Byzantine sources have only a limited value for the economic history of Turchia in this period, for while histories such as those of Pachymeres, Gregoras, Dukas, Kantakuzenos and Chalcocondyles discuss Turks, they tend to concentrate on what was of most significance for them, Turkish territorial expansion and gradual dominance of Byzantine politics, rather than on any commercial activity

---

<sup>1</sup> The published primary sources consulted are listed in the bibliography.

within the empire. In any case medieval historians rarely touched on economic complexities.

Apart from western sources, there is some Arabic material, the works of ibn Battuta and al-`Umari, and Ottoman sources. Ottoman material for the period before 1453, particularly for the fourteenth century, is very sparse, limited largely to a few chronological lists, the earliest of which dates from 1421, Ahmedi's *History of the Ottoman Kings* from probably the 1390s, a few documents, the number of which increases slightly from the 1430s, and a small number of inscriptions and coins from the fourteenth century. Dating from the latter part of the fifteenth century there are chronicles which deal with the earlier period, those of Aşıkpasazade, Oruç, the Anonymous Chronicles, and Enveri and Şukrullah. The works of Aşıkpaşazade, Oruç and the Anonymous Chronicles rely on the chronological lists and no longer extant chronicles from the fourteenth century. Aşıkpaşazade, born around 1400, incorporated into his *History of the House of Osman*, which he finished in 1482, pieces from a history, now lost, written by Yahşi Fakih, as well as relying on his own memory. Neşri, writing slightly later, produced his history, using much of the work of Aşıkpasazade<sup>1</sup>. None of the above histories are particularly helpful when dealing with trade. Apart from chronicles and chronological lists from the later fifteenth century, there are documents, such as *kanunnames* and *sicils* from the reign of Mehmed II, which

---

<sup>1</sup> For Neşri's sources see V L Ménage, *Neshri's History of the Ottomans. The Sources and Development of the Text*, (London, 1964), pp.10-19.

can be used, with caution, for comparative purposes and as indicators of what the position could have been in a slightly earlier period. It must however constantly be borne in mind that to rely entirely on material from a later period to elucidate an earlier one is open to danger.

Unfortunately I was unable to consult the Başbakanlık Arşivi in Istanbul. Although I had a research permit for three months, I was not allowed for the entire period of my stay there to do more than see the catalogues. The exact reasons for refusing me permission were not clear.

? / secondary sources

## CHAPTER I

### MONEY

It is not within the scope of this thesis to investigate thoroughly the monetary aspect of the Turkish economy, which is an extremely complex issue and one much hampered by the nature of the sources<sup>1</sup>. It is, however, necessary to indicate the problems when dealing with currencies in the period and to look briefly at the methods of exchange used.

During this period certain currencies predominated in the eastern Mediterranean. Initially the Byzantine gold coin, the *hyperpyron*, which was divided into 24 *karati*, was the major currency of the region. During the fourteenth century however it lost its predominance, becoming a money of account and after the middle of the century the *hyperpyron* in circulation was silver<sup>2</sup>. The *hyperpyron* was replaced as the "dollar" currency of the eastern Mediterranean by the *florin*, a coin struck first in 1252 in Florence, which largely dominated trade in western Europe, which in, turn, in the fifteenth century, was superseded by the Venetian ducat, a gold coin first minted in 1284 and which in the fifteenth century became so dominant that the term *ducat* became synonymous with gold coinage. The Genoese *genovino*, first

---

<sup>1</sup> The importance of research into the monetary system is highlighted by A S Ehrenkreutz: "To achieve meaningful progress in the field of medieval Near Eastern economic history one must take into account its monetary aspects", 'Monetary Aspects of Medieval Near Eastern Economic History' in Cook, *Economic History*, p.37.

<sup>2</sup> Bertele, 'Iperpero bizantino' pp.81, 83; Spufford, *Handbook*, p.286.

struck, like the *florin*, in 1252, although of great importance in general in the Mediterranean, never became a dominant coinage in the Levant. The *hyperpyron/ducat* (*florin*) exchange rate was 2:1 for much of the fourteenth century, dropping after approximately 1389 to around 3:1<sup>1</sup>.

In Turchia the major coin was the *akçe* (Greek *aspron*, Latin *asper*), a silver coin struck also in Trabzon and Caffa<sup>2</sup>. The weight of the *akçe* and thus its value in relation to other currencies varied according to where the *akçe* was minted. The various beyliks, such as Menteşe and Aydın, struck their own *akçe*<sup>3</sup> as did the Ottomans, whose coin came to predominate as they took over the main commercial centres, first Bursa, then Edirne and finally Constantinople. Under the Ottomans, the first coins struck with a date and place of minting were similar to coins of the Ilhans, whose style of coinage affected that of the Ottoman *akçe*<sup>4</sup>. Unfortunately, the lack of data makes it difficult to produce

---

<sup>1</sup> Bertelè, 'Iperpero bizantino', p.84.

<sup>2</sup> For Turkish *akçes* see İbrahim Artuk, 'Karesi-oğulları adına basılmış olan iki sikke' in *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi* vol. 33 (1980/81) (İstanbul, 1982), p.283; İbrahim Artuk, 'Early Ottoman Coins of Orhan Ghazi as Confirmation of his Sovereignty' in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History. Studies in Honor of George C Miles*, Dickran K Kouymjian (ed.), (American University of Beirut, 1974), pp.457-463; İbrahim Artuk, 'Murad'ın sikkelerine genel bir bakış 761-792 (1359-1389)' in *Belleten*, vol. 184 (1982), pp.787-793; Wittek, *Menteşe*, pp.155-159.

<sup>3</sup> al-`Umari, p.335.

<sup>4</sup> İbrahim Artuk, 'Early Ottoman Coins of Orhan Ghazi as Confirmation of his Sovereignty' in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History. Studies in Honor of George C Miles*, Dickran K Kouymjian (ed.), (American University of Beirut, 1974), pp.459, 461.

any precise idea of what the different *akçe* were worth at any specific point. From the accounts of Giacomo Badoer it is clear that in the money markets of Constantinople in the late 1430s the Turkish *akçe*/*hyperpyron* rate of exchange fluctuated daily<sup>1</sup> but remained in the region of between approximately 10.5 and 11 *akçes* per *hyperpyron*. The exchange rate of *akçes* of Samsun and a *hyperpyron* was, in the same period, around 19:1, while that of the *akçe* of Caffa was 20:1. On this basis, the rate of exchange between an Ottoman *akçe* and a Samsun *akçe* was 1:1.73. The *akçe*-*ducat* rate in the same period was around 33:1.

RATIO OF TURKISH <u>AKCE</u> TO HYPERPYRON			
DATE	<u>AKCE</u>	HYPERPYRON	SOURCE
1436.iv.8	11 <u>aspers</u> 2 <u>tornexi</u>	1	Badoer, <u>Libro</u> , c.48 p.96, c.29 p.59
1436.iv.10	11 <u>aspers</u> 2 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.48 p.96, c.3 p.7
1436.iv.30	11 <u>aspers</u> 2 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.56 p.112, c.3 p.7
1436.ix.7	11 <u>aspers</u> 6 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.3 p.6, c.7 p.15
1436.xi.8	11 <u>aspers</u> 4 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.33 p.66, c.16 p.33
1436.xi.8	11 <u>aspers</u> 4 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.33 p.66, c.18 p.37
1436.xi.8	11 <u>aspers</u> 4 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.33 p.66, c.33 p.67
1436.xii.5	11 <u>aspers</u> 4 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.16 p.32, c.29 p.59
1436.xii.7	11 <u>aspers</u> 4 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.33 p.66, c.16 p.33

---

<sup>1</sup> The text gives no explanation for these small percentage fluctuations which were presumably the result of supply and demand on the money markets.



1437.ii.17	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.175 p.352, c.125 p.253 (the cross reference is to c.134 but should be to c.125)
1437.iii.11	11 <u>aspers</u> 2 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.36 p.72, c.55 p.111
1437.iii.13	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.63 p.126, c.55 p.111
1437.iii.16	11 <u>aspers</u> 9 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.61 p.122, c.57 p.115
1437.iii.31	11 <u>aspers mancho tornexi</u> 5	1	ibid, c.125 p.252, c.186 p.375
1437.iii.31	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.125 p.252, c.204 p.411
1437.iii.31	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.125 p.252, c.204 p.411
1437.iv.13	11 <u>aspers 1.5 tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.55 p.110 (cross references to c.48, but there is no corresponding entry there)
1437.iv.30	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.57 p.114, c.43 p.87
1437.iv.30	11 <u>aspers 1.5 tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.55 p.110, c.36 p.73
1437.iv.30	11 <u>aspers 1.5 tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.56 p.112, c.36 p.73
1437.iv.30	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.56 p.112, c.57 p.115
1437.vii.9	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.61 p.122 (cross references to c.57 but there is no corresponding entry there)
1437.vii.9	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.61 p.122 (cross references to c.57 but there is no corresponding entry there)
1437.vii.18	11 <u>aspers mancho tornexi</u> 5.5	1	ibid, c.125 p.252, c.183 p.369
1437.vii.18	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.48 p.96, c.57 p.115
1437.vii.18	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.48 p.96, c.57 p.115
1437.vii.20	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.48 p.96, c.75 p.153
1437.vii.23	11 <u>aspers 4 tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.61 p.122, c.33 p.67
1437.vii.23	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.48 p.96, c.75 p.153
1437.vii.24	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.92 p.186, c.88 p.179
1437.viii.5	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.175 p.352, c.125 p.253

1437.viii.5	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.175 p.352, c.125 p.253
1437.viii.5	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.175 p.352, c.125 p.253
1437.viii.5	11 <u>asperes</u>	1	ibid, c.175 p.352, c.125 p.253
1437.viii.21	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.93 p.188, c.92 p.187
1437.ix.2	11 <u>aspers mancho tornexi</u> 5.5	1	ibid, c.125 p.252, c.231 p.465 (c.231 = 1 <u>hyperpyron</u> = 11 <u>aspers mancho</u> 5 <u>tornexi</u>
1437.ix.18	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.82 p.166, c.175 p.353
1437.ix.20	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.57 p.114, c.60 p.121
1437.ix.20	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.57 p.114, c.43 p.87
1437.ix.20	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.57 p.114, c.60 p.121
1437.ix.20	100 <u>aspers</u>	9	ibid, c.116 p.234, c.57 p.115
1437.x.9	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.92 p.186, c.47 p.93
1437.xi.28	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.131 p.264, c.46 p.93
1437.xi.28	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.131 p.264, c.46 p.93
1437.xii.23	11 <u>aspers mancho un tornexe</u>	1	ibid, c.167 p.336, c.131 p.265
1437.xii.24	11 <u>aspers mancho un tornexe</u>	1	ibid, c.167 p.336, c.131p.265
1438.iii.20	11 <u>aspers mancho tornexi</u> 5	1	ibid, c.197 p.396, c.186 p.375
1438.iii.20	10.6 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.197 p.396, c.186 p.375
1438.vi.1	11 <u>aspers mancho tornexi</u> 5.5	1	ibid, c.186 p.374, c.201 p.405
1438.vi.7	11 <u>aspers mancho tornexi</u> 6	1	ibid, c.194 p.390, c.186 p.375
1438.iv.16	10.5 <u>aspers</u> 3 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.316 p.634, c.155 p.313
1438.viii.5	11 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.191 p.384, c.175 p.353
1438.viii.18	10.5 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.227 p.456, c.61 p.123
1438.viii.18	10.5 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.230 p.462, c.89 p.181
1438.ix.18	10.5 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.247 p.496, c.175 p.353
1438.ix.18	10.5 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.247 p.496, c.175 p.353
1438.xii.13	10.5 <u>aspers</u> 2 <u>tornexi</u>	1	ibid, c.227 p.456, c.209 p.421

1438.xii.28	10.5 <u>aspers</u>	1	ibid, c.134 p.270, c.227 p.457
-------------	--------------------	---	--------------------------------

RATIO OF <u>AKCE</u> OF SAMSUN TO ONE HYPERPYRON		
DATE	<u>AKCE</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>
1437.xi.28	19	Badoer, <u>Libro</u> , c.102 p.206, c.152 p.307. c.102 has 17 <u>aspers</u> per <u>hyperpyron</u> . c.152 has 19, the correct figure as shown by the calculation of the figures given in the entry
1437.xii.18	19	ibid, c.44 p.188, c.152 p.307.
1437.xii.18	19	ibid, c.44 p.188, c.152 p.307.
1437.xii.18	19	ibid, c.152 p.306, c.44 p.89.
1437.xii.18	19	ibid, c.152 p.306, c.152 p.307.

RATIO OF <u>AKCE</u> OF TRABZON TO ONE HYPERPYRON		
DATE	<u>AKCE</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>
1436.xi.5	33.3	Badoer, <u>Libro</u> , c.21 p.42, c.7 p.15
1436.xi.10	33.3	ibid, c.7 p.14, c.7 p.15
1437.i.2	36	ibid, c.173, p.348, c.166, p.335
1437.i.22	36	ibid, c.166 p.334, c.166 p.335
1437.i.24	40	ibid, c.173 p.348, c.51 p.103
1437.i.24	36	ibid, c.153 p.308, c.173 p.349
1437.xii.5	36	ibid, c.153 p.308, c.51 p.103
1437.xii.5	36	ibid, c.153 p.308, c.51 p.103
1437.xii.5	36	ibid, c.153 p.308, c.51 p.103
1437.xii.5	36	ibid, c.90 p.182, c.153 p.309
1437.xii.18	40	ibid, c.51 p.102, c.166 p.335

1437.xii.18	40	ibid, c.166 p.334, c.44 p.89
1437.xii.18	40	ibid, c.166 p.334, c.152 p.307
1438.iv.19	36	ibid, c.153 p.308, c.173 p.349
1438.iv.19	36	ibid, c.153 p.308, c.153 p.309
1438.iv.19	36	ibid, c.153 p.308, p.153 p.309
1438.iv.19	36	ibid, c.185 p.372, c.153 p.309
1438.iv.19	36	ibid, c.185 p.372, c.153 p.309
1438.xii.8	36	ibid, c.278 p.558, c.185 p.373
1438.xii.18	36	ibid, c.288 p.578, c.185 p.373

RATIO OF HYPERPYRA TO ONE TURKISH DUCAT		
DATE	HYPERPYRA	SOURCE
1436.i.13	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 1.5 <u>karati</u>	Badoer, <u>Libro</u> , c.3 p.7. The cross reference is to c.16 but there is no corresponding entry on that page. This and the next two entries are all part of the same transaction but with varying exchange rates
1436.i.13	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 1 <u>karati</u> 2 <u>tornexi</u>	ibid
1436.i.13	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 2 <u>karati</u> 10 <u>tornexi</u>	ibid
1436.ii.13	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 10 <u>tornexi</u>	ibid, c.48 p.96, c.29 p.59
1436.ii.20	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 1.5 <u>karati</u>	ibid, c.3 p.6, c.48 p.97
1436.ii.20	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 1.5 <u>karati</u>	ibid, c.40 p.80, c.48 p.97
1437.iii.8	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 1.5 <u>karati</u>	ibid, c.51 p.102, c.48 p.97 This and the next entry are the same transaction but with two different exchange rates
1437.iii.8	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 2.5 <u>karati</u>	ibid, c.51 p.102, c.48 p.97

1437.xi.2	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 1.5 <u>karati</u>	ibid, c.40 p.80, c.48 p.97
1438.iii.23	2 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.180 p.362, c.186 p.375

Apart from a silver coinage, the Turkish rulers struck a gold *ducat* in imitation of that of Venice<sup>1</sup>. In the late 1430s there were in the region of 80 Ottoman *akçes* to one Turkish *ducat* and one Turkish *ducat* to around 2.05 *hyperpyra*. Turkish minting of imitation *ducats*<sup>2</sup> caused, in the case of Aydın, a strain on relations with Venice. In 1368 Venice decided to send an ambassador to Theologos to ensure that the emir ceased striking imitation ducats, which were causing grave damage to Venetian interests<sup>3</sup>. This embassy was

---

<sup>1</sup> Saminiato de' Ricci refers to "duchatì d'Altoluogho" in his account book, p.110. The Turks also struck copper coins, see İbrahim Artuk, 'Karesi-oğulları adına basılmış olan iki sikke' in *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi* vol. 33 (1980/81) (İstanbul, 1982), p.284; Artuk, İbrahim, 'Murad'ın sikkelerine genel bir bakış 761-792 (1359-1389)' in *Belleten*, vol. 184 (1982), pp.789-790; Wittek, *Menteşe*, pp.156, 157.

<sup>2</sup> For imitation *ducats*, dating from c.1350-1360 and probably originating in the emirate of Aydın, see S Bendall and C Morrison, 'Un trésor de ducats d'imitation au nom d'Andrea Dandolo (1343-1354)' in *Revue Numismatique*, série 6, vol.XXI (1979), pp. 184, 188.

<sup>3</sup> 1368.iii,2 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no.451, pp.115-116. The success of this mission, the other aims of which were the release of Venetian prisoners and the restitution of 2,000 *ducats* taken from Niccolò Morosini, was seen as of such importance that should the ambassador be unable to secure the emir's co-operation, he was to order all Venetian merchants out of the emirate. See also 1369.x.12 : ibid, no.481, p.122.

successful and the emir signed an agreement in which he agreed to destroy the mould for minting and to stop any striking of ducats in the form of those of Venice in his territories<sup>1</sup>. Menteşe too minted imitation ducats, persisting in this despite a clash with Venice<sup>2</sup>. Another western coin imitated by the Turks was the *gigliato*, a coin of Charles II of Anjou, struck in Naples at the beginning of the fourteenth century<sup>3</sup>. Apart from imitation western coins there were also false *akçe*<sup>4</sup>.

One aspect of the European economy in the late medieval period was the bullion drain of silver from the west eastwards. Much silver did flow into the Mamluk empire, the main destination of European cash being Alexandria, a major emporium for luxury goods. Silver bullion formed part of the cargo of ships sailing there from Venice<sup>5</sup>. Within Turchia

---

<sup>1</sup> 1370.x.1 = Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no.481, pp.160-161: "delere cunium ducatorum, et precipere quod in terris suis vel aliqua ipsarum terrarum non stampentur amplius ducati ad formam ducatorum vestrorum".

<sup>2</sup> DVL, II, no.95.

<sup>3</sup> Wittek, *Menteşe*, p.155; P Lambros, 'Monnaie inédite de Sarukhan émir d'Ionie, frappée à Ephèse (1299-1346)' in *Revue Numismatique*, nouvelle série, vol.14 (1869-1870), p.340; S Bendall and C Morrison, 'Un trésor de ducats d'imitation au nom d'Andrea Dandolo (1343-1354)' in *Revue Numismatique*, série 6, vol.XXI (1979), p. 186, note 23; J Karabacek, 'Gigliato des karischen Turkomanenfürsten Urchan-beg' in *Numismatische Zeitschrift* (1877) Bd.9; J Karabacek, 'Gigliato des jonischen Turkomanenfürsten Omar-beg' in *Numismatische Zeitschrift* (1870) Bd.2.

<sup>4</sup> 1438= Badoer, *Libro*, c.230, p.462, c.249, p.501, an entry for 17 false aspers.

<sup>5</sup> Frescobaldi, p.35. Frescobaldi travelled from Venice to Alexandria in 1384 on a ship part of whose cargo consisted of silver bullion.

too cash played an important part in commercial exchange and silver, and gold, were apparently at times in short supply. According to Neşri, Anatolia suffered a shortage of gold and silver in the 1380s<sup>1</sup>. Dr Zhukov has explained this as being in part the result of the discontinuance of the transit trade in alum in Menteşe and Aydın after the Ottoman take over of Kütahya in 1381, which thus deprived the emirs of hard currency<sup>2</sup>. Dr Zhukov further argues that the shortage of precious metals combined with the large volume of production was reflected in the low prices commented on by ibn Battuta. But ibn Battuta was referring to the 1330s, a period very different from the 1380s. Further, there was not a discontinuance of trade activity in this period and, in any case, the Ottomans would hardly have been affected by a discontinuance of the alum trade through Menteşe and Aydın, and indeed could only have benefited from their take over of Kütahya. In fact Neşri's remark is hard to explain. The reign of Murad was one of increasing wealth both in terms of trade and of territorial expansion. Neşri's mention of the shortage is presumably as an explanation of why there was no gold or silver in the *peşkeş* brought by the ambassador of the Germiyan ruler to Murad and perhaps its significance is in

---

<sup>1</sup> Neşri, (Menzûl Codex), p.55; (1949), p.204: "ol zamanda Anadolu'da altun ve gümüş az olurdu".

<sup>2</sup> Zhukov, *Эгейские Эмираты*, p.100. It seems too strong to refer, as Dr Zhukov does, to an almost complete paralysis of the alum trade in Aydın and Menteşe after the Ottomans took over the mines of Kütahya. His argument relies heavily on regarding Scorpiata as a new source of alum, which does not necessarily seem to have been the case. See Ch. III, section three.

the wedding of Bayezid to the daughter of the Germiyan ruler. These presents included gold and silver trays filled with gold florins<sup>1</sup>.

Western merchants took cash with them when they went into Turchia to trade<sup>2</sup>. Money was changed into Turkish *akçes* in Constantinople where, in the 1430s, the bankers charged 1% on the transaction<sup>3</sup>. Apart from *akçes*, Turkish *ducats* too were traded there<sup>4</sup>. Not only western merchants acted as bankers but Turks too handled currency, changing *aspers* and *hyperpyra*<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Neşri, (Menzil Codex), p.56; (1949), p.206.

<sup>2</sup> 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.44, p.88, c.152, p.307, 1436.ii.15 = *ibid*, c.44, p.88, c.48, p.97. Antonio da Negroponte took with him on his voyage to Samsun and Trabzon three Turkish *ducats* and had with him in cash in Samsun 1,165 *aspers* of Samsun; 1438.iii.20 = *ibid*, c.197, p.396, c.186, p.375 (*aspers* bought for trade in Tekirdağ (Rodosto) and Kırklareli (former Kırk-kilise, called XL Chiezie by Badoer), west of Edirne; 1437.iii.31 = *ibid*, c.125, p.252, c.186, p.375 (*aspers* for trade in Gelibolu (Garipoli)); 1436.xi.8 = *ibid*, c.33, p.66, c.18, p.37, c.16, p.33 (19,000 Turkish *aspers* for trade in Bursa).

<sup>3</sup> 1438.x.21 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.285, p.572, an entry for 65 Venetian *ducats* and 3,000 Turkish *aspers* sent to Constantinople from Edirne. One expense was for selling the *ducats*: "per provixion de vender i duchati e dar i denar a chanbio, meto in tuto [a] j per c "; 1437.vii.24 = c.92, p.186, c.88, p.179, c. 77, p.157, c.47, p.95, 1437.vii.26 = *ibid*, c.47, p.94, c.92, p.187, 1437.xi.23 = *ibid*, c.121, p.244, c.47, p.95, all entries concerning 5,100 Turkish *aspers* bought and sent to Bursa for purchasing pepper. The cost of buying *aspers* was 1%: "per acatar i diti asperi a una per c ".

<sup>4</sup> 1436.ii.13 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.48, p.96, c.29, p.59; 1436.ii.13 = *ibid*, c.48, p.96, c.3, p.7.

<sup>5</sup> 1436.ix.7 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.3, p.6, c.7, p.15: "per Saliet turcho per asp.2000 turchesci ch'el mese per mio nome in bancho". A second entry two days later reads "per el dito turcho ch'el mese in bancho fra asperi e perpari a mio chonto".



That cash payment grew in importance as the Ottoman empire developed is indicated by the Ragusa government's concern in 1441 over the need to acquire silver, for the Turks required payment for everything in money<sup>1</sup>. This presumably represents a development in the economic strength of the empire under the early Ottoman rulers. Whereas, in the first part of the fourteenth century, the Turks, that is the rulers of the various beyliks in western Anatolia and the Ottomans, were not in a position to insist on a method of payment, by the middle of the next century the Ottomans were strong enough to dictate economic terms. That the Ottomans would increasingly find themselves in need of hard currency is understandable for as the state developed, its needs could no longer be met solely by booty and the new administrative structures which grew up needed payment in cash.

Cash was not, however, the only method used in commercial transactions and much exchange went on by means of bartering<sup>2</sup>. It seems reasonable to assume that bartering was used also by western merchants in Turchia for it would have been a highly practical way of trading, doing away with the necessity of carrying much cash or of converting other currencies into the various types of aspers used in Turchia.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1441.xii.15 : Krekič, *Dubrovnik*, no.971, pp.325-326.

<sup>2</sup> Giacomo Badoer's account book gives many examples of bartering between merchants, eg. 1437.xi.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.148, p.298, Azi Baba, variously described as a Saracen ("sarain", 1437.xii.4 = *ibid*, c.148, p.298) and a Moor ("moro", 1437.xi.17 = *ibid*, c.148, p.299) bartered cloth for pepper; 1438.ii.12 = *ibid*, c.251, p.505; 1438.ix.18 = *ibid*, c.241, p.484, c.241, p.485.

Apart from bartering, another method of exchange existed, the letter of exchange. In the fourteenth century major economic developments were underway, particularly in the City States, developments which spread outwards linking much of western Europe<sup>1</sup>. Of these, one of the most important was the establishment of banking, which began first in Italy where Genoa led the field, other cities apparently being much slower to establish transfer banking<sup>2</sup>.

Before the development of the banking system, money changers had changed currency into pounds of unminted gold dust or cast ingots of silver, these being necessary for merchants paying for goods outside the area of the currency they held. This system gradually transformed when money changers began in some large commercial centres, the most advanced of which in this respect was Genoa, to take deposits and then, on depositors' instructions, to transfer from one account to another. The next development was to transfer from one bank to another in the same city, and then to transfer from one account in a bank in one city to a bank in another city<sup>3</sup>. These bankers ran current accounts on which no interest was paid, and deposit accounts which did attract interest and in which money had to be deposited for a certain

---

<sup>1</sup> For an account of the development of banking and the use of bills of exchange see Spufford, *Handbook*, pp.xxvi-1.

<sup>2</sup> Spufford, *Handbook*, p.xxxviii.

<sup>3</sup> Merchants could transfer from different banks in Genoa as early as the end of the 12th century. By the early 14th century Florence was reputed to have as many as 80 banks, Spufford, *Handbook*, p.xxviii.

length of time, so allowing its use by the banker, who was not then in danger of having the depositor withdraw his money for some time. This enabled bankers to invest in long-term trade ventures. Together with the banking system, there developed the use of the cheque.

The banking system developed more slowly outside Italy but was clearly functioning in much of western Europe in the early fourteenth century although it remained throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries restricted to only certain commercial centres and its use was restricted to only a small percentage of the population. Coin remained the major factor in economic exchange.

Apart from the development of a local banking system, there was a contemporaneous and analogous development of an international banking system which clearly had significant implications for the conduct of international trade. The development of the bill of exchange "revolutionised" international trade in the thirteenth century and by the first half of the fourteenth century this system was commonly used between many cities of western Europe<sup>1</sup>. By combining local and international banking, a merchant was able to buy a bill of exchange by debiting one bank account in one country and crediting another in a different country.

Under the system of a bill of exchange a merchant in Genoa, for example, could remit money for goods in Avignon by paying the amount required in Genoa to a drawer or taker who

---

<sup>1</sup> Its early development can be seen in Genoa at the end of the 12th century, Spufford, *Handbook*, p.xxxi.

drew up the bill which the merchant then sent to his fellow merchant in Avignon. There, the other merchant presented the bill to the payer who acted as agent for the drawer of the bill in Genoa. Settlement of the bill had to be made within a fixed time, *usance*, the length of which varied according to custom. The charge for a bill of exchange varied, up to 5% of the amount involved being commonly charged.

This system operated extensively in northern Italy, also functioning in commercial centres in southern Italy, France, Spain, England, the Netherlands and southern Germany. By the fifteenth century it was also possible to use bills of exchange in Prague, Krakow and Buda.

While it is true that as one moves east bills of exchange become less prolific, the system still operated and there were bills of exchange between Italy and Constantinople<sup>1</sup>. Letters of exchange were not always without problems for sometimes the receivers refused to accept them<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example see 1438.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.241, p.484 + c.234, p.471; 1437.ix.18 = *ibid*, c.89, p.180, c.101, p.205, 1437.ix.20 = c.89, p.180, c.29, p.59 (from Venice); 1437.ix.16 = *ibid*, c.105, p.212, c.104, p.211 (from Venice); 1437.ix.16 = *ibid*, c.105, p.212, c.104, p.211 (from Venice); 1437.ix.16 = *ibid*, c.105, p.212, c.105, p.213 (from Venice); 1437.ix.16 = *ibid*, c.105, p.212, c.89, p.181 (from Venice); 1437.ix.16 = *ibid*, c.105, p.212, c.105, p.213; 1437.ix.18 = *ibid*, c.105, p.212, c.101, p.205 (from Venice); 1437.ix.26 = *ibid*, c.105, p.212, c.101, p.205 (from Venice); 1437.ix.18 = *ibid*, c.90, p.182, c.105, p.213 (to Venice); 1437.x.23 = *ibid*, c.129, p.260, c.105, p.213 (to Venice); 1437.xi.13 = *ibid*, c.133, p.268, c.105, p.213 (to Venice); 1436.ix.18 = *ibid*, c.47, p.94, c.106, p.215 (from Venice) 1438.x.8 = c.250, p.502, c.231, p.465

<sup>2</sup> 1439.iii.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.266, p.534, c.320, p.643, a letter of credit was not accepted in Venice; 1438.ii.3 = *ibid*, c.292, p.586, c.382, p.767, an entry for "una letera de chanbio" which Francesco Trivixan did not wish to accept.

As the bill of exchange was used extensively in transactions between merchants in Constantinople and city states such as Venice, it would seem unexpected if western merchants, accustomed to a system of letters of credit, did not adopt this system, at least on occasion, in their dealings with their own agents in cities in Turchia such as Bursa and Edirne. This, in fact, seems to have been the case. In 1437 Dimitri Argiti of Chandia travelled to Gelibolu taking with him "un scritto" for 1,177 aspers which he delivered to Agustin di Franchi, a merchant trading there<sup>1</sup>. Dimitri Argiti also took 3,000 aspers to Gelibolu<sup>2</sup>. Although it is not stated that this was in the form of a letter of credit, it seems possible that in fact it was, for the wording of one of the two entries concerning the 1,177 aspers is simply "per asp.1177 che Mandi" while that for the 3,000 aspers is "per l'amontar de asp.3000 che i mandi". In the same year a letter of credit was sent for 1,200 Turkish aspers to Bortolamio de Modena in Gelibolu<sup>3</sup> and Agustin di Franchi

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.iii.31 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.125, p.252, c.204, p.411: "Dimitri Argiti de Chandia diè aver a di 31 mazo per el viazo da Garipoli rechomandà a Agustin di Franchi, per un scritto de asp.1177 ch'el me fexe a dover chonsignar in Garipoli al dito Agustin, val a asp.11 el perparo". Agustin di Franchi appears several times in the accounts for this year in connection with Gelibolu, 1437.x.9 = *ibid*, c.125, p.252, c.92, p.187; 1437.iii.13 = *ibid*, c.55, p.111; 1438.ix.18 = *ibid*, c.65, p.131.

<sup>2</sup> 1438.iii.31 = *ibid*, c.125, p.252, c.186, p.375.

<sup>3</sup> 1437.iv.30 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110: "per ser Charlo Chapel dal bancho per asp.1200 turchi ch'el dè per mio nome a ser Franzesco di Drapieri per una letera de chanbio che me mandò a pagar Bortolamio da Modena da Garipoli per altratanti asperi ch'el rezevè in Garipoi da Jeronimo da..., fator del dito ser Franzesco, val a asp.11 t.1 1/1 a perparo".

took 1,593 aspers to Gelibolu to settle with Aluvixe di Franchi a letter of exchange which Aluvixe had paid, in Giacomo Badoer's name, to the Jew Süleyman (Sulaiman zudio)<sup>1</sup>. In 1438 payment was to be made to Zuan Andrea and Jachomo de Chanpi for a letter of credit to Bortolamio di Franchi in Edirne<sup>2</sup>.

Various methods of payment were thus used by Genoese and other western merchants in their commercial transactions with the Turks. Another aspect of the income generated by this exchange must be considered before turning to the commodities which formed this commerce, and that is the taxes levied on international trade.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.ix.2 = *ibid*, c.125, p.252: "per Charlo Chapelo dal banco per l'amontar de asp.1593 ch'el sorascrito ser Agustin me mandò a pagar per una letera de chandio a miser Aluvixe di Franchi, val a asp.11, mancho t.51/1 a perpero", c.231, p.465: "per el viazo de Garipoli rechomandà a Agustin di Franchi, per l'amontar de asp.1593 che per mio nome el dè a miser Aluvixe di franchi per un chanbio da Garipoli val a asp. 11 mancho t. 5 a perparo, chome el tolse da Sulaiman zudio per mio nome."

<sup>2</sup> 1438.xii.3 = c.233, p.468: "per ser Zuan Andrea e ser Jachomo da Chanpi, che fixi prometer al dito, hover al suo chomeso, per una letera che scrisi ai diti in Andrenopolli", c.234, p.471: "Ser Jachomo e Zuan Andrea da Chanpi diè aver a di 3 dizenbre per ser Bortolamio di Franchi, per una promessa che i scrisi che i dovesse far al dito ser Bortolamio, hover al suo chomeso".

## CHAPTER II

### TAXES

In order to gain any understanding of the economic history of Turchia in the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries it is essential to look at the tax system, at what taxes were imposed, how, on whom and why. If one can understand how the tax system worked, this in turn contributes to an understanding of how the markets worked and to forming some concept of what economic policies may have been followed by the Turkish rulers.

As always for this area and this period, one is faced with the problem of sources. Economically useful data are scant. There is little Turkish material and one must rely largely on contemporary Latin and Byzantine sources together with Ottoman material from a slightly later period.

As the Ottomans borrowed prolifically from the systems which they found in place in the areas they conquered, even taking over tax terms from the native languages of such places<sup>1</sup>, it seems reasonable to assume that Byzantine trade taxes could form a useful guideline to taxes charged both in the beyliks and under the Ottomans. Indeed the Ottoman word for customs, *gümruk*, is itself derived from the Greek

---

<sup>1</sup> See S. Vryonis, 'The Byzantine Legacy and Ottoman Forms' in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XXIII-XXIV (1969-70), p.278, where he gives examples of terms applied to *avariz-i divaniye* ve *tekalif-i örfiye*, extraordinary taxes and taxes based on common law, such as *angarya*, *irgadiyya*, *sinir*, and *parik* from Greek.

*komerktion*<sup>1</sup>. Byzantine practices certainly had a strong influence on Ottoman practices in western Anatolia<sup>2</sup>.

It also seems reasonable, always with a certain caution, to look at taxes which are known to have existed in the post 1453 era as a guide for those which may have been imposed in the Ottoman empire in the period before the conquest of Constantinople. The Ottomans had, after all, been by then established for some considerable time in the area and it seems feasible that there would have been a continuity of taxes between the pre - and the post - 1453 periods. Documents from the reign of Mehmed II refer, for example, to customs charges being imposed "according to custom": *`adet üzre*<sup>3</sup>, *Edirne `adeti üzre*<sup>4</sup>, *gerü `adet üzre*<sup>5</sup>, *olub-gelmiş*

---

<sup>1</sup> Antoniadis-Bibicou, *Douanes*, pp.105-106. For a different view see Atan, *Türk Gümrük Tarihi*, pp.114-115 who points to possible derivation from Greek *kommerkium*, Latin *commercium* or Greek *kümerki*. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*, lists the word *gümrük* as being derived from Latin *commercium*. According to Turan, *Resmi Vesikalar*, p.128, note 20, *gümrük* comes from *komerktion*.

<sup>2</sup> See Halil İnalcık, 'The Problem of the Relationship between Byzantine and Ottoman Taxation' in *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongresses*, 1958 (Munich, 1960), pp.237-42 where he argues that the Ottoman system of land taxation was based on the Byzantine model.

<sup>3</sup> No date (reign of Mehmed II) = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.45, p.63; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.46, clause 9, p.135; 1476.i.14 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *ibid*, no.33, p.46; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.34, clause 3, p.111; c.1476.i.14 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *ibid*, no.34, p.47; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.35, clause 4, p.112; 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *ibid*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.56, clause 2, p.151.

<sup>4</sup> 1476.i.14 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.33, p.44; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.33, clause 2, p.109; c.1476.i.14 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *ibid*, no.34, p.47; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.35, clause 2, p.111.



`adet üzre<sup>1</sup>, olub-gelen `adet üzre<sup>2</sup>, evvelden olub-gelmiş  
`adet üzre<sup>3</sup>, evvel olub-gelmiş `adet üzre<sup>4</sup> and olub-gelmiş  
kanun<sup>5</sup>. As these phrases seem to be formulae it would  
probably be difficult to base any argument on any time  
difference implied, evvelden olub-gelmiş `adet üzre for  
example being stronger than `adet üzre and perhaps implying  
a custom of longer duration. It seems reasonable to assume  
however that in at least some cases customs rates levied  
after the fall of Constantinople were the same as those  
charged in the Empire before 1453.

From this collection of sources one is able to build up  
a range of taxes that may have been charged in Turchia in

---

<sup>5</sup> 1454-63 or 1479-81 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.30, p.41; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.31, clause 2, p.104.

<sup>1</sup> No date (reign of Mehmed II) = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.45, p.64; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.46, clause 13, p.136; Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.35, p.48; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.36, clause 10, p.115; 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.53, p.74, p.75; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no. 54, clause 4, p.146, clause 5, p.147, clause 8, p.147; 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.56, clause 6, p.151; 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 3, p.153.

<sup>2</sup> Post 1453 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 3 p.118.

<sup>3</sup> Post 1453 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 3, p.118; Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.35, p.48; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.36, clause 10, p.115; 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.56, clause 6, p.151; 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 5, p.153.

<sup>4</sup> 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, p.75; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no. 54, clause 8, p.147.

<sup>5</sup> 1454-63 or 1479-81 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.30, p.40; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.31, clause 2, p.104.

fourteenth and first half of fifteenth centuries. Taxes on trade which appear under the Ottomans include *bac* or *tamğa*, *kapan* (*kabban*) or *mizan* or *terazu rusumu*, *gümrük*, *geçid resmi*, *köprü hakkı*. Chalkokondyles refers to passage of ships and thoroughfare being taxed<sup>1</sup>. Latin sources give names for taxes in the eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea regions such as *comerchium*, *dacium*, *censaria*, *drittus*, *introytus*, *justitia*, *amalim*, *appalto*, *gabella*. But the problem often is to define these taxes precisely. This is particularly the case with *appalto* or *gabella*.

✓  
see p.  
267

### Appalto and Gabella

*Appalto* and *gabella* were charged in western Anatolia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. These terms were, according to Pegolotti, the same thing<sup>2</sup>. This seems to be confirmed by a clause in the 1337 treaty between Hızır of Aydın and Giovanni Sanudo, the Duca di Candia, in which the Venetians were exempted from paying "*apalto sive gabella*" on goods they brought in or took out<sup>3</sup>. Quite what the nature of this tax was, is, however unclear.

Professor Zachariadou describes the *gabella* as a monopoly whereby goods could not be sold freely on the open market but

---

<sup>1</sup> Chalkokondyles, (Budapest), II, pp.197-201.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, pp.56, 82.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192.

had to go through the hands of specified officials<sup>1</sup>. Dr Zhukov too seems to imply that it represented the imposition of an exclusive right to trade in a specific commodity<sup>2</sup>. However it may be argued that in fact the *gabella* was not a monopoly but a farmed tax<sup>3</sup>.

The problem is how to distinguish between a monopoly and a farmed tax since the result of the imposition of either can appear the same, that is the control of a commodity, product or tax. Moreover, the arguments with which one can establish the existence of one can often just as easily be used to establish the existence of the other. But that a farmed tax and a monopoly were two different things is clear. A *berat* of Mehmed II to the '*âmiller* (tax farmers) who had the tax farm of the *hass* villages of Istanbul and Galata specifically stated that the monopoly (*monobolya*) was to be retained<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, pp.134-135, 154.

<sup>2</sup> Zhukov, *Эгейские Эмираты*, p.86 and note 20. On this basis Dr Zhukov claims that wine and soap were goods which only farmers and possibly privileged people had the right to trade in Aydın. However what was restricted was not the right to trade but the right to collect tax on that trade. This does not mean that on occasion wine may not have been in fact a monopoly but the imposition of the *gabella* is not relevant in this respect.

<sup>3</sup> The translation of the term *in appalto* or *in gabella* given by A. Evans in his edition of the trade manual of Pegolotti is "farmed out": Pegolotti, p.440.

<sup>4</sup> Post 1454.iv.18 or end 1458 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.37, p.51; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.38, clause 4, p.120; Post 1454.iv.18 or end 1458 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *ibid*, no.38, p.52; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.39, clause 3, p.121. In the sixteenth century in Hungary the collector of the tax on the wine was granted the privilege of *monopolya* whereby only he had the right to sell wine for a specific period of two months and ten days. Here too, there could be a perceived confusion since the collector of taxes and the

There is a very thin line however between farming out the collection of state revenue, in the form of taxes, and total control of the commodity or production on which the taxes are being collected. It might be that in order to collect taxes effectively, the tax farmer was granted control over production or trade, resulting in a *de facto* monopoly<sup>1</sup>. In order to collect a tax on, for example, the sale of a commodity, that sale would have to go through the hands of the tax farmer or his authorized representative. The outcome might then, to all intents and purposes, be a monopoly. But what was meant by the terms *appalto*, *gabella* and the Ottoman term *`âmil* remains the imposition of a tax farm or a tax farmer and not that of a monopoly. A further confusion arises because a monopoly could well be granted to the holder of the tax farm. In the sixteenth century, for example, the tax farmer of the *mukataa* of a soapmaking workshop was often granted the monopoly over production whereby any other import or production of soap was prohibited. This granting of a monopoly to tax farmers was also applied in the sixteenth

---

holder of the monopoly is one and the same person. But the two issues remain separate. See Suraiya Faruqi, 'Rural Society in Anatolia and the Balkans during the sixteenth century', I in *Turcica* vol.IX/1 1977, 174.

<sup>1</sup> The autonomy of the tax farmer resulted in the sixteenth century in the gradual change of relations of production when the *tımar* system was replaced by tax farming of the collection of the *ôşr* taxes, a result of the state's need to increase revenue depleted by population expansion and price rises resulting from European price inflation. See Immanuel Wallerstein, Hale Decedeli, Reşat Kasaba, 'Incorporation of the Ottoman Empire into the world-economy' in *The Ottoman Empire and the World-Economy* ed. Huri İslamoğlu-İnan (Cambridge, 1987), p.90.

century to farms of other commodities<sup>1</sup>.

This problem of distinguishing between a monopoly and a farmed tax is illustrated by Professor Zachariadou's use of Zibaldone da Canal in support of the *appalto/gabella* being a monopoly<sup>2</sup>. According to Zibaldone da Canal, the Algerian port of Bona was a land "in gabella", in which only those holding the *gabella* could buy goods. Zibaldone lists what the *gabelloti*, presumably meaning the holders of the *gabella*, paid for various commodities and how much of that price the *gabelloti* gave as a fee or tribute ("per fio") to the government or court ("la corte")<sup>3</sup>. If the collection of sales tax was undertaken by tax farmers, then clearly, in order to avoid any evasions, all sales would have had to go through their hands. This would not however make the *gabella* a monopoly per se, but would rather be a consequence of the system of farming out the collection of sales tax.

---

<sup>1</sup> Suraiya Faroghi, 'Rural Society', I in *Turcica* vol.IX/1 1977, 187.

<sup>2</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.135.

<sup>3</sup> Zibaldone da Canal, p.47: "Bona si è tera la qual sé in gabella, in la qual tera non può nessun conprar intro se no quelli che àno la gabella, ma chi vuol si può vendere chui vien de fora et aduga soa merchadantia e paga XJ per C, sallvo de formento che non se paga se no miarexi 2 per cafesse.

Bona

Li gabelloti compra la lana bexanti 10 e dà nde 4 per fio a la corte e compra li cori bexanti 6 e paga bexanti 4 a la corte e compra li bolldroni bexanti 10 e paga bexanti 2 per fio a la corte e compra la çera bexanti 35 e dà nde 5 a la corte e compra le agnelline bexanti 6 e dà nde 2 a la corte per fio".

*Gabella* in Bona thus applied to export only for there was no restriction over selling imposed on those who came into the country from abroad, brought their goods in and paid 11%, presumably as customs.

The Greek for gabella was *γαπέλα* or *καμπέλα* and for a monopoly was *μονοπώλιον* which came into Ottoman as *monaboliya*<sup>1</sup>. As the terms *gabella* and *appalto* appear in the treaties of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries between Menteşe, Aydın and Venice and as these treaties were originally written in Greek and then translated into Latin, it seems more likely that the original term used in these documents was *γαπέλα* or *γκαμπέλα* for if what was meant was a monopoly then most probably the term used would have been *μονοπώλιον*.

The word *gabella* is itself from the Arabic *kabala* one of the meanings of which was the farming of special revenues such as the sale of salt. It was with this meaning that it was used by the Spanish (*alcabala*), the Italians, the Normans in Sicily and later by the French (*gabelle*)<sup>2</sup>.

In the treaty of 1407 between Menteşe and Venice the word *gabella*, or *appalto*, is replaced by *amalim*<sup>3</sup>. That *amalim* was indeed an equivalent of *appalto/gabella* is obvious from a comparison of its use in the 1407 treaty with that of *appalto/gabella* in the treaties of 1403 and 1375<sup>4</sup>. It would

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.134, note 569 and p.135, note 574. See Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.37, p.51, no.38, p.52, no.47, p.67 for *monaboliya*.

<sup>2</sup> C Cahen, 'Kabala' in *EI2*.

<sup>3</sup> 1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1407M, clause 22, p.236.

<sup>4</sup> 1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1407M, clause 22, p.236: "Item de vino, sapone, tellis, lineis, cera, pellibus, alumine et aliis rebus conductis per subditos Venetorum, pro exitu et introitu non debeamus ponere amalim excepto quod pro vino solvi debeat aspra L pro buta et similiter pro dimidia buta et caratello pro ratione". 1403.

be interesting to know why the term *amalim* appears in 1407 but is not used in the earlier extant treaties. One might be tempted to suggest that it was because this treaty, unlike previous ones, was translated not from Greek but from Turkish, which was being used at that time, and thus reflected the Turkish term. The 1403 treaty between Süleyman and the Latins was written in "ydiomate turcho"<sup>1</sup> while a Genoese document of 1414 states that Cristoforo Picenino translated for Sipahi Bayezid from Turkish into Latin<sup>2</sup>. This however cannot have been the case for it is stated at the beginning of the treaty that it had been translated from Greek into Latin<sup>3</sup>. Is it possible that by this period Turkish terms were beginning to predominate in the vocabulary

---

vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231: "Item pro vino, sapone, tellis, cera, pellamine et aliis rebus quas portaverint subiecti Venetorum, in introitu et exitu non debeamus ponere gabelam excepto vino pro quo debeant pro vegete aspra L ; similiter mezana et caratellum pro ratione". Doc.1403M DVL is almost word for word the same except it uses *datium* in place of *gabelam*. 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 22, p.222: " Item promittimus et volumus quod vinum, sapo, caseus et telle, cera, pellamen et alumen et omnia alia mercimonia, quae adducunt Cretenses vel Veneti vel alii fideles comunis Venetorum vel voluerint de terris nostris extrahere, non debeant poni in apalto, excepto vino quod volumus quod solvat aspros L pro quolibet vegete et sic de ratione solvant pro caratello et non aliud". Compare this clause also with 1337.pre iv = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198: "Item promittimus et volumus quod vinum...et omnia alia mercimonia, quae adduxerint Cretenses vel Veneti vel alii fideles comunis Venetorum vel voluerint de terris nostris extrahere, non debeant poni in apalto...".

<sup>1</sup> 1403 = G T Dennis, 'The Byzantine-Turkish Treaty of 1403', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 33, 1867, 77.

<sup>2</sup> 1414.vii.16 = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1, doc.311. See Appendix One, doc.14.

<sup>3</sup> 1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1407M, clause 1, p.234.

of the trading Turkish states in their dealings with western merchants and that the terms *appalto/gabella* were being gradually superseded by their Turkish equivalent?

*Amalim* was presumably a Latin rendering of the term *`amal*<sup>1</sup>, synonymous with the term *mukataa* which in general meant a tax farm<sup>2</sup>. Beldiceanu describes *mukataa* as meaning, in fifteenth century Ottoman, the farming out of control by the Sultan of, for example, state enterprises, such as mining, or of tax collection<sup>3</sup>. *`âmil* was applied by the Ottomans to officials charged with the collection of taxes, or to the *mültezim* (a farmer of state revenue) or to someone collecting money in the name of a *mültezim*<sup>4</sup>. The word *`amaldâr* appears in Ottoman documents and chronicles and is synonymous with the word *`âmil*<sup>5</sup>. Since the word *amalim* is

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.135, note 575.

<sup>2</sup> Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*, defines the term as "a branch of the public revenue of Turkey farmed out for a term of years for a fixed term". Under the Mongols in Anatolia the *mukâta`ât* too had the same meaning as in Classical Islamic terminology, ie. leases of tax farms, Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp.332-333.

<sup>3</sup> Beldiceanu, *Actes*, II, p.141.

<sup>4</sup> Beldiceanu, *Actes* II, p.159 defined *`âmil* as meaning in documents of the second half of the fifteenth century someone who farmed goods or taxes belonging to the state for a fixed term.

<sup>5</sup> Fuad Köprülü, *`âmil* in *İA*. For its use in *firman* see for example Elezović, *Turski Spomenici*, II, no.39, p.64, no.51, p.78, no.52, p.79, no.57, pp.84-85. Under the *`Abbasids* the term *`âmil* was used for a public official, a financial official charged with the collection of tax or an important official in the administration of a large district or town. It seems in general to have meant a financial official who collected taxes. Under the Seljuks it could be applied to a *vali* (governor of a province) but was particularly used for officials of state, especially those involved in finance. The Mamluks and Ilhans also used the



used in the treaty of 1407 as synonymous with *appalto/gabella*, and since *'amal* means tax farm, this seems a strong argument for taking *appalto/gabella* as a tax farm, not a monopoly.

A main aspect of tax farming is clearly the buying and selling of the right to collect, and one finds that in the fourteenth century the *appalto/gabella* was indeed bought and sold. In Chios the buyer of the *gabella* on wine in 1404 was Giovanni de Castilione<sup>1</sup> while that of half a per cent imposed on goods shipped from Chios in 1408 by the Protettori of San Giorgio was sold to Galeazzo di Levanto<sup>2</sup>. In the court case brought against Ettore de Flisco and Ottobono Giustinian in Pera in 1402 Ettore and Ottobono were described as being partners in the *gabella* which had been bought by Batista Spinolla from the Byzantine Emperor<sup>3</sup>. Some years later, in 1443, those farming the tax on wine in Crete were compensated for losses incurred as a result of a prohibition imposed on Venetian vessels sailing to the island<sup>4</sup>.

The *appalto* was also farmed out under the Ottomans.

---

term mostly for financial officials, as did Timur.

<sup>1</sup> 1404.xii.15 = Argenti, *Chios*, II, p.161.

<sup>2</sup> Argenti, *Chios*, I, p.422.

<sup>3</sup> 1402.v.30 = ASG, San Giorgio 34, n.590/1306, f.102r: "particeps in cabellis emptis per Baptistam Spinullam, a domino Imperatore Romeorum"; 1402.v.11 = *ibid*, f.150r: "illicite et inhoneste participasse pro baratis duobus in nonnullis cabellis venditis per dominum Imperatorem Romeorum Batiste Spinulle et aliis burgensibus Peyre". They were sentenced to pay 25 *hyperpyra* each "mitigata eis pena propter parium lucrum sive damnum quod exinde pro huiusmodi participatione cabellarum".

<sup>4</sup> 1443.v.27 = Noiret, *Documents*, p.404.

Indeed tax-farming was, according to Huri İslamoğlu-İnan and Çağlar Keyder, integral to the Ottoman tax system from the very beginnings of the Ottoman state, providing the rulers with their main source of liquid funds<sup>1</sup>. Murad I apparently farmed out taxes for an *`amaldâr* is mentioned in *`Aşıkpaşazade* at the beginning of his reign<sup>2</sup>. In 1452 Paris Giustinian, Paolo Bocardo and Benedetto Salvaigo promised to pay Francesco de Draperiis 12,000 gold *ducats* of Chios, which sum was to include the c.5,000 *ducats* which they owed him for 400 pieces of Genoese cloth, if Francesco, presumably acting as their agent, obtained or renewed the *appalto* of the alum mines in Grecia and Turchia which he at present held from the Ottoman Sultan<sup>3</sup>. Mehmed II used tax farmers to collect customs charges<sup>4</sup>, as well as other revenues. Immediately

---

<sup>1</sup> Huri İslamoğlu-İnan and Çağlar Keyder, 'Agenda for Ottoman history' in *The Ottoman Empire and the World-Economy*, Huri İslamoğlu-İnan, ed, (Cambridge, 1987), p.58.

<sup>2</sup> *Aşıkpaşazade*, (Giese), p.88, (Istanbul), p.99.

<sup>3</sup> 1452.x(?).28 = ASG, Not. Bernardo de Ferrari in Argenti, Chios, III, no.222, p.659: "si ipse dominus Franciscus aut alius pro se aut opere ipsius obtinuerit seu reformaverit appaltum et seu appaltus Alumeriarum Grecie et Turchie quod ad presens habet ac obtinet ipse d. Franciscus a Teucrorum domino seu in ipso restent et permaneant ut ad presens est et permanet quod dicti d. Paris et socii de gratia speciali teneantur et obligati sint et sic promiserunt subvenire dicto d. Francisco ac dare et solvere complementum [?] ducatorum duodecim milium auri de Chio...". Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.50, note 64 dates this document 1451.xii.28.

<sup>4</sup> Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, nos.45, pp.61-65; 36, pp.49-50; 30, pp.40-41; 33, pp.44-46; 34, pp.46-47; 53, pp.73-76; 35, pp.47-49; 55, pp.78-79; 56, pp.80-81. (The corresponding documents in Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, are: nos.46, pp.133-136; 37, pp.116-118; 31, pp.41-43; 33 and 34, pp.108-111; 35, pp.111-112; 54, pp.146-148; 36, pp.112-126; 56, pp.151-152; 57, pp.152-153). In the *tahrir defteri* of 892/1487 of Hudavendigar sancağı one of the tax farms

after the conquest of Constantinople, the rents from Greek houses handed over to the new inhabitants, were assigned to tax farmers<sup>1</sup>. If one looks at the Sultan's income in 1475 one sees what a prominent position tax farming held in the state revenue. *Gabelle* were sold in Gelibolu (Galipoli) and Istanbul on a head tax on slaves brought into Turchia as booty and on a transit tax on men, both on foot and on horse back<sup>2</sup>; in Constantinople, on wine, all types of wood, the Sultan's warehouses ("pensione di apothege del Signore"), baths and markets ("bezeschani")<sup>3</sup>; on the rice of Filibe (Plovdiv, Philipopolis), Zagora, Serres and other places of Graecia<sup>4</sup> and on the sown rice and wheat ("frumenti") of Karaman<sup>5</sup>. *Gabelle* formed part of the annual income of the island of Negroponte<sup>6</sup>, made up part of the income of the *berlerbeyi* and other officials of Graecia<sup>7</sup> while the revenues of Kastamonu included the *comerchio* on the copper mines which

---

("mukata'alar") for Bursa was that of the customs ("gümrük"), İnalçık, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar', p. 57.

<sup>1</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, *Giese*, p.133: "bu virdikler evlere mukata'a vaz` itdiler", (1970), p.142-43: "bu virdikler evleri mukata'aya virdiler". See also Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa Livası*, p.87.

<sup>2</sup> Jacopo de Promontorio, p.62.

<sup>3</sup> Jacopo de Promontorio, p.63.

<sup>4</sup> Jacopo de Promontorio, p.65.

<sup>5</sup> Jacopo de Promontorio, p.68.

<sup>6</sup> Jacopo de Promontorio, p.64.

<sup>7</sup> Jacopo de Promontorio, p.68.

were sold "in apalto" and various other *gabelle*<sup>1</sup>. Of the other named revenues listed, such as the *comerchio*, the *pedagio* and the *carachio* (ie *haraç*), the great majority were sold for three years. Of those which were not specified as being sold, it seems possible that this was in fact done, for the three year figure is given for them too, three years being the usual period for a tax farm. In any case, the importance of tax farming as a source of state revenue is clear.

Given this evidence that the *appalto/gabella* was not a monopoly but a farmed tax, the next question which arises is whether it was a specific tax that was farmed out, or any farmed tax, the significance being not the type of tax but the fact that it was farmed. According to Dr Zhukov, clause 11 of the 1337 treaty between Venice and Aydın "clearly contradicts" clause seven of the same treaty<sup>2</sup>. Clause 11 states that wine, soap and other commodities were not to be placed under *appalto* or *gabella* while clause seven establishes that *dacio* was to be charged on soap and wine<sup>3</sup>. This apparent contradiction is removed if one does not equate *appalto/gabella* with *dacio* as Dr Zhukov seems to do. It is true that in the two extant copies of the 1403 treaty the terms are apparently used interchangeably, in one copy the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacopo de Promontorio, p.67.

<sup>2</sup> Zhukov, *Эгейские Эмираты*, p.157, note 20.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192, clause 7, p.191.

term *dacium* being used and in the other, *gabella*<sup>1</sup>, but here too, this does not mean necessarily that the two terms are contradictory, for *dacium* is the tax, *gabella* meaning the manner in which a tax was levied, ie. it was farmed. Moreover, it is unlikely that the treaty of 1337 would have contained contradictory clauses. A more feasible explanation would be that the terms did not in fact mean the same thing. But, on the contrary, given the examples cited above, the *appalto/gabella* would not have indicated a simple tax, that is a *dacio*, but an exaction which was farmed out. If this is so, the two clauses, far from being contradictory, differentiated between a specific tax and a farmed out revenue, thus reinforcing the supposition that the *appalto/gabella* was a farmed tax and not a specific tax in itself.

In order to ascertain whether this argument is valid, one needs to look at examples of the application of *appalto/gabella* to establish what commodities it was imposed on. *Appalto/gabella* often appears without any commodity being mentioned. In the agreement between the Maona of Chios and the Comune of Genoa in 1413 the Genoese complained that the Comune was being harmed by "oneribus maxime diuersarum compararum et assignationum spectantium et pertinentium ad uarias et diuersas personas singulares quibus assignati sunt omnes introitus et redditus cabellarum et quorumcunque

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403.vii.24 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade* doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231 ("gabelam"), doc.1403M DVL, clause 22, p.231 ("datium").

introituum dicti comunis"<sup>1</sup>. Greeks in the Byzantine Empire, wishing to escape the "cotimos et gabellas" of the Emperor, pretended to Venetian citizenship, Venetians being free from these *gabelle*<sup>2</sup>.

*Appalto/gabella* could also be imposed on specified commodities. In Aydın and Menteşe *gabella* was imposed on wine, soap, cheese, canvas, alum, wax, skins and other merchandise and foodstuffs from which the Venetians were exempted in 1337<sup>3</sup>. It seems that certainly for wine, soap and alum this was a recent concession for under a treaty of the same period between Menteşe and Crete, the emir of Menteşe was to have the right to place alum alone under *gabella* if the emir of Aydın made an agreement with Venice under which wine, soap and alum remained subjected to the *gabella*<sup>4</sup>. Soap, canvas, wax, skins and other goods were to be exempted from *gabella* for the Venetians under the 1403 treaty between Menteşe and Crete. Wine however was to be

---

<sup>1</sup> 1413.iii.11 = Argenti, *Chios*, II, p.220.

<sup>2</sup> 1359.iii.19 : Chrysostomides, 'Venetian Privileges', no.6, p.336.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192: "Et quod vinum, saponem, casseus, telle, lumen, cera, pellamen et cetera alia victualia et grossa, quae nostra gens et mercatores ac Veneti et fideles dicti domini Ducis et omnes predicti portabunt ad loca sua predicta et quae ipsi extrahere volent, non ponantur in apolto sive *gabella*." The word used by Professor Zachariadou is "grossa" but Miss Chrysostomides has pointed out that this should in fact be "grassa".

<sup>4</sup> 1337.pre iv = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 28, p.199.



placed under *gabella*<sup>1</sup>. *Gabellas* were also imposed by the Mamluk Sultan on commodities such as spices<sup>2</sup>. In Tunis wine was under *gabella* at the end of the thirteenth century<sup>3</sup>. "*Cabelle seu Introytus*" of half a *florin* per *vegete* of wine imported into the island ("*forensis delati ad ciuitatem et Insulam chii*") existed in Chios in 1351 and 1404<sup>4</sup>. In 1418 the Venetians complained of a "*novam gabellam*" imposed by the Byzantine Emperor on wine<sup>5</sup>. In New Phokaea "*cabellas et introytus*" were paid on alum and other goods at the end of the fourteenth century<sup>6</sup>. "*Cabellas seu collectas*" were

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403.vii.24 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231: "Item pro vino, sapone, tellis, cera, pellamine et aliis rebus quas portaverint subiecti Venetorum, in introitu et exitu non debeamus ponere gabellam excepto vino pro quo solvi debeant pro vegete aspra L ; similiter mezana et caratellum pro ratione." The other version of this treaty, *ibid*, doc.1403M, DVL, clause 22, p.231, refers not to *gabella* but to *datium*.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.9 "Lez proffis duquel trafficq [ie. of Cairo], c'est assavoir celles que sont licites et honestes, comme sonet lez gabellez ordinaires, lesquelles respondent au souldain, outres lez mangeries dessusdictes, cestes gabelles sont trésors innumérables tous lez ans"; p.76 "pourquoy lez grans gabelles et esforssement qu'il fait sur lez espices costent plus la motié qu'elle ne costeroient".

<sup>3</sup> Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalan*, pp.298,523,549; pre 1300 = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.391, pp.392-393, 395-396.

<sup>4</sup> Report of Gregorio di Marsupino to Marshal Boucicault dealing with tax in Chios and the rights of the Maona in New Phokaea: 1404.xii.15 = Argenti, *Chios*, II, pp.161, 164, 165, 166. The rate is repeated in 1405.xi.26 = *ibid*, p.172. In an order from Marshal Boucicault in response to Gregorio di Marsupino's report: 1404.xii.16 = *ibid*, II, p.167. This phrase is repeated in a list of taxes paid in New Phokaea, 1405.ii.14 = *ibid*, II, p.170.

<sup>5</sup> 1418.iii.11 = Chrysostomides, 'Venetian Privileges', no.18, p.354.

<sup>6</sup> 1394.ii.18 = ASG, Not. Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filze 1, doc.97/240.

imposed on wine and oil in 1404 in Chios<sup>1</sup>. Under Mehmed II there were *gabellas* on wine, wood, rice, copper mining and wheat<sup>2</sup>.

There are also references in the sources to *appalto/gabela* being applied to all merchandise in general. In Aydın and Menteşe it could apparently be applied to all goods, for under both the 1337 Aydın-Venice treaty and that of 1403 between Menteşe and Venice all goods, including several specifically listed, were subject to *gabella*, an exemption being granted for Venetians. A *gabella* of half a per cent was imposed in 1408 on all merchandise shipped from Chios to among other places Turchia<sup>3</sup>.

APPALTO AND GABELLA				
DATE	NAME	PLACE	COMMODITY	SOURCE
?pre 1300	<u>gabella</u>	Tunis	wine	Tafel-Thomas, <u>Urkunden</u> , III, no.391, pp.392-393, 395-396
1310-1340	<u>appalto</u> <u>gabella</u>	Theologos	soap, wine	Pegolotti, p.56

---

<sup>1</sup> 1404.xii.15 = Argenti, *Chios*, II, pp.161, 164, 165, 166

<sup>2</sup> Jacopo de Promontorio, pp.63, 65, 67, 68.

<sup>3</sup> Argenti, *Chios*, I, p.422.



1337	<u>apolto</u> <u>gabella</u>	Aydin	wine, soap, cheese, linen, wax, hide, all other merchandise and victuals and <u>grassa</u>	1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192. (The word in Professor Zachariadou's text is "grossa" but Miss Chrysostomides has pointed out that this should in fact read <u>grassa</u> )
1337	<u>apalto</u>	Menteşe	wine, soap, cheese, linen, wax, hide, alum and all other merchandise	1337.pre.iv = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198
1337	<u>apalto</u>	Aydin	wine, soap, alum	1337.pre iv = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1337M, clause 28, pp.199-200
1337	<u>apalto</u>	Balat	alum	1337.pre iv = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1337M, clause 28, pp.199-200
1358	<u>apalto</u>	Menteşe	alum	1358.x.13 = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1358/1359A, clause 8, p.218
1375	<u>apalto</u>	Menteşe	wine, soap, cheese, linen, wax, hide, alum and all other merchandise	1375.iv.2 = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1375M, clause 22, p.222
1375	<u>apalto</u>	Aydin	soap, wine, alum	1375.iv.2 = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1375M, clasue 28, p.223

1375	<u>apalto</u>	Balat	alum	1375.iv.2 = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and Crusade</u> , doc.1375M, clause 28, p.223
1394	<u>gabella</u>	New Phokaea	alum	1394.ii.18 = ASG, Notaio Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filze 1, doc.97/240
end 14th beginning 15th centuries	<u>gabellae</u>	Alexandria	spices	Piloti, p.76
1402	<u>gabellae</u>	Pera	unspecified	1402.v.30 = ASG, San Giorgio, sala 34, n.590/1306, ff.101r-102r
1403	<u>gabella</u>	Mentege	wine, soap, linen, wax, hide and other goods	1403.vii.24 = Zachariaodu, <u>Trade and Crusade</u> , doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231
1404	<u>gabella</u>	Chios	wine, oil	1404.xii.15 = Argenti, <u>Chios</u> , II, no., p.161
1408	<u>gabella</u>	Chios	all merchandise from Chios by sea to places including Turchia	1408.ii = Argenti, <u>Chios</u> , I, p.422
1452	<u>appaltus</u>	Grecia Turchia	alum mines	1452.x.28 = Argenti, <u>Chios</u> , III, no.222, pp.658-659
1475	<u>gabellae</u>	Negroponte	<u>comerchio</u> includes all <u>datij</u> , <u>gabellae</u> and harac ( <u>carachio</u> )	Jacopo do Promontorio, p.64
1475	<u>gabellae</u>	Kastamonu	<u>comerchio</u> on copper, sold <u>in apalto</u> + other various <u>gabellae</u>	Jacopo do Promontorio, p.67

1475	<u>gabelle</u>	Gelibolu İstanbul	On slaves coming into Turchia as booty sold by the Sultan	Jacopo do Promontorio, p.62
1475	<u>gabella</u>	Gelibolu Istanbul	on men in transit on horseback	Jacopo do Promontorio, p.62
1475	<u>gabella</u>	Gelibolu İstanbul	on men in transit on foot	Jacopo do Promontorio, p.62
1475	<u>gabella</u>	Filibe Zagora Serres other places in Grecia	rice	Jacopo do Promontorio, p.65
1475	<u>gabella</u>	Gelibolu Istambul	wine, sultan's warehouses, baths, markets	Jacopo do Promontorio, p.63
1475	<u>gabella</u>	Karamania	sown rice and wheat	Jacopo do Promontorio, p.68

Thus it is clear that, being applied to a multitude of different commodities, both imported and exported, the *appalto/gabella* was unlikely to have been in itself a specific tax. This argument is further strengthened by the imposition of the *appalto/gabella* on other taxes. *Gabellas* were applied to brokerage taxes (*censaria*) in Chios at the beginning of the fifteenth century for an ordinance of the Maona of Chios issued in 1402 stated that "*aliqua cabella non imponatur in Chio contra formam convencionum tam grecis quam latinis sub pena auferenda potestati et si aliqua indebita est removeatur omnino et precipue cabella censarie sub dicta pena auferenda potestati*"<sup>1</sup>. Under Mehmed II the *gabella* was applied to toll taxes and to a head tax on slaves brought

---

<sup>1</sup> 1402.xi.27 = Argenti, Chios, II, p.182.

into Turchia as booty<sup>1</sup>. The *commerchio* on the copper of Kastamonu was sold *in apalto*<sup>2</sup>. *`amal* in the second half of the fifteenth century could be applied to the collection of customs<sup>3</sup>, to brokerage tax<sup>4</sup>, and to toll tax (*tarik-i `am*)<sup>5</sup>. Much later, in 930-938/1523-1532, the stamp duty on cotton cloth (*damga-ı boğası*) was in the hands of tax farmers<sup>6</sup>.

It therefore appears that the *appalto/gabella* was not a specific tax related to any particular commodity or group of commodities. Moreover it seems that it was not restricted to either imports or exports but, as the above examples show, was applicable to both. That the *gabella/appalto* was an unspecified tax which was farmed is strengthened by the entry in the sultan's revenue listed by Jacopo di Promontorio for

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, p.62.

<sup>2</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, p.67.

<sup>3</sup> 1479.xi.10 = İnalçık, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar' no.20, p.80 ("Brusa gümrüğünü mukata`ayı dutan Gelibolılı Mihayıl oğlu İlyas"); *ibid*, p.57, for Bursa in 892/1487; c.1476.1.14 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *kanunname*, no.33, p.44, Beldiceanu, *Actes I*, no.33, pp.108-109 ("mukata`aya verdüm" of customs on wheat, barley, oats, millet and flour in Constantinople); c.1476.1.14 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.34, pp.46-47, Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.35, p.111 (as for previous document); 1476.1.28-11.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.53, pp.73-74, Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.54, p.146 ("mukata`aya verdüm" customs for listed ports including Istanbul, Galata and Gelibolu); 1482.1.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80, Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, p.152 ("Samsun ve Sinob iskeleleri gümrüğü mukata`aya verüldüm").

<sup>4</sup> 1476.1.28-11.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, pp.73-74, Beldiceanu, *Actes I*, no.54, p.146 ("mukata`aya verdüm " brokerage on broad and cloth, "çuka ve kumaş dellaliğile", in Istanbul and Galata).

<sup>5</sup> İnalçık, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar', p.56, in Bursa in 892/1487.

<sup>6</sup> Faroqhi, 'Production of Cotton', pp.408-409.

the *comerchio* of copper in Kastamonu which was sold in *apalto* together with other various *gabelle*<sup>1</sup>. From this one might infer that the *comerchio* of copper was itself a *gabella*.

Turning to the administration of the *appalto/gabella*, one is immediately struck by the number of western merchants involved in its administration in Muslim lands. Catalans administered the *gabella* in Tunis where, in 1285, under the Peace of Panissar, the Sultan of Tunis agreed to grant the *gabella* of Tunis to a Catalan in preference to anyone else. According to Ch Dufourcq, this seems to have meant that a Catalan became a sort of "fermier général" of the customs taxes of Tunis<sup>2</sup>. In the same year the King of Aragon's instructions to his new ambassador to Tunis, Betran de Mesurata, were to ensure that the new Consul was to take on as soon as possible the farm of the *gabella* of Tunis ("à ferme la gabelle de Tunis")<sup>3</sup>. Two years later Alphonso III sent Conrad Lancia as ambassador to Tunis. Lancia was to make sure that the farming of the *gabella* was reserved for subjects of Aragon<sup>4</sup>. Similar instructions were given, again by Alphonso III, to the ambassador Bernat de Belvis in 1290. Catalans were to be given preference in the farming of the *gabella* over Genoese and Pisans while those who took the *gabella* were to be allowed to settle by monthly payments

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, p.67.

<sup>2</sup> Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalan*, p.273, and notes 5 and 6.

<sup>3</sup> Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalan*, p.274.

<sup>4</sup> Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalan*, p.282.

rather than one single one<sup>1</sup>. In 1291 the *gabella* of wine there was granted to Cervia de Riera<sup>2</sup>. In the same period, Marcus Carosus bought the *gabella* of wine from the Sultan of Tunis for 34,000 *bessants*. The Sultan later withdrew the *gabella* from him, selling it instead to a Pisan, thereby causing a Venetian complaint about Carosus's treatment<sup>3</sup>. The Sultan behaved similarly to a Pisan, Raynerio Martello, to whom he at first sold the *gabella* on wine and from whom he later withdrew it<sup>4</sup>. In 1305 a Genoese held the *gabella* of Algiers<sup>5</sup>.

The Ottomans too seem to have made great use of western or Christian merchants as collectors of the *appalto/gabella*<sup>6</sup>, a practice which may have been in operation under Murad I. In 1390 in instructions to Francesco Quirino, the Venetian ambassador to Bayezid I, the Senate instructed Quirino to try and secure free access to Ottoman ports for Venetian subjects whereby they would not have to deal with Frankish agents, who had in the past mistreated them. If Quirino could not obtain free access, then he was to ensure that the agents were Venetians. The Senate also stated that Turks were preferable

---

<sup>1</sup> Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalan*, p.292.

<sup>2</sup> Dufourcq, *LEspagne catalan*, pp.298,523,549.

<sup>3</sup> Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.391, pp.392-393.

<sup>4</sup> Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.391, pp.395-396.

<sup>5</sup> Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalan*, pp.368. note 3, 452.

<sup>6</sup> There are many examples from the second half of the fifteenth century of Christians buying tax farms from the Ottoman Sultan, Beldiceanu *Actes* II, pp.142-143.

to Frankish agents<sup>1</sup>. The Franks who treated the Venetians badly could well, considering relations between them, have been Genoese. It is also likely that the Venetians were here attempting to establish a new arrangement under the new Ottoman ruler, an alteration of the position which had existed under his predecessor. Thus, if this interpretation is correct, the Genoese were acting as tax farmers of, probably, customs taxes, as they were active in the ports and collecting from Venetians, under Murad I. The fact that the senate instructed Quirino that, when it was necessary to deal with agents, it would be better if they were Venetian, indicates that Venetians too farmed taxes under the Ottomans in this period.

Later, in the fifteenth century, Genoese merchants are known to have farmed taxes under the Ottomans. The alum mines in Turchia and Grecia were held from the Sultan in *appalto* for in 1452 Paris Giustinian, Paolo Bocardo and Benedetto Salvaigo promised to pay Francesco de Draperiis if he obtained or renewed this *appalto*<sup>2</sup>. At the beginning of 1476 the customs of Istanbul on wheat, barley, oats, millet and flour were sold for three years to Kesarid-oğlu Kaysara,

---

<sup>1</sup> 1390.iii.6 = *Monumenta Peloponnesica*, no.68: "non sit necesse nostratibus, qui ibunt in locis sibi subiectis quod vadant per manus aliquorum Franchorum qui emunt de suis scalis et qui temporibus retroactis non bene tractarunt nostros. Et sis potius contentus velle ire per manus Turchorum quam per manus talium Franchorum, reducendo tibi ad memoriam quod quando posses obtinere quod nostratos non haberent agere ad ipsas suas scallas cum aliquibus personis, et quando pur deberent agere cum aliquibus personis, ipsi haberent agere cum nostris, hoc summe nobis placeret."

<sup>2</sup> 1452.x(?).28 = ASG, Not. Bernardo de Ferrari in Argenti, *Chios*, III, no.222, p.659

Galatalu Petr Uri (or Petrauri) ( غدرطالر پتر اوری ) and to 'Amil-oğlu Menteşe, for one million akçe and 12,000 akçe for *resm-i berat* (berat tax)<sup>1</sup>. The name Petr Uri or Petrauri is clearly not Turkish but could well be Italian, Petro Auri perhaps, and, being an inhabitant of Galata, it is possible that the person concerned was Genoese. Kesarid oğlu Kaysara was, judging from the name, probably Greek. Greeks bought tax farms from the Ottoman sultans after the conquest of Constantinople. In 1476, for example, Paloloğoz Kandroz, Lefteri bin Galbanoz, Andiri bin Halkokandil, Manul Paloloğoz, and Ya'kub bought the farm of customs in ports including Istanbul, Galata, Gelibolu, Mudanya and ports to the borders of Aydın ili and the brokerage for cloth in Istanbul and Galata<sup>2</sup>. Several years later, in 1482, the farm of the customs of Samsun and Sinop was sold to Tebrizoğlu Ermeni Ya'kub and Kostandin "nam zimmi"<sup>3</sup>. In 1476 the farm of the Istanbul customs was sold for three years to a four-man consortium of Muslims for 13 million akçe. To win the tax farm the consortium out-bid a five-man consortium of Greeks who had offered 11 million akçe (c.245,000 ducats)<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1476.i.14 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.33, p.44; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.33, pp.108-9. The same names appear also in Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no. 34, p.46, and Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.35, p.111. See also facsimile 76a and 80a in Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*.

<sup>2</sup> 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, pp.73-74; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.54, p.146. The name Galbanoz is given as Galyanoz in Beldiceanu.

<sup>3</sup> 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.57, p.108.

<sup>4</sup> İnalçık, 'Capital', p.124.



In 1480 Anton oğlu Skroz (?) from Galata held the tax farm of the soap factories in Ankara<sup>1</sup>. At a much later date, at the end of the sixteenth century, *mültezims* of mastic in Chios were often Jewish and the *emin*, (the Sultan's agent), was, according to a *mukataa defteri*, required to be a non-Muslim<sup>2</sup>. This is a striking example of the continuation of a system operating before Ottoman conquest which the Porte simply incorporated into its own administration. Before Ottoman conquest, the Maona of Chios had often relied on Jewish money, in consequence of which Jews came to share in the mastic produced. When the Ottomans took over the island, the mastic crop became a *hass* of the *Valide Sultan* and Jewish involvement continued.

The presence of western merchants in such a capacity needs some explanation. With tax farms there is one obvious point: those that bought them had to have money, something which the large trading families from western city states would have had. They would also have had expertise. It would seem that the Ottomans were able to put this foreign wealth and expertise to use in the administration of their own empire, not merely in the initial stages of its development, but well after the conquest of Constantinople and the firm establishment of a large and flourishing state.

A tax farm had distinct advantages for the state which thereby gained an assured income without the attendant risks.

---

<sup>1</sup> 884.Zilka`. 8 / 1480.1.21 = İnalçık, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar', no.25, p.82: "Mahruse-i Ankara sabun hanelerin mukata'aya dutan Anton oğlu Skroz [?] 'an Galata".

<sup>2</sup> Suraiya Faroqhi, 'Rural Society', p.181.

The risk factor presumably explains in part why both Latin and Turkish governments were interested in selling tax farms for they were thereby guaranteed a fixed sum, were spared any problems involved in collection, and ran no risk of reduced profits on a fluctuating market. At the same time, of course, they could lose out if the market at any particular time entered a boom in which case profits would naturally accrue to the tax farmers. In the second half of the fifteenth century the Sultan apparently preferred to farm out mines, thereby assuring a secure source of income without any capital investment in what was after all a high risk enterprise<sup>1</sup>. It seems that in the later period when in a difficult financial position, the Ottoman government chose to increase the use of tax farming as a way of avoiding risk, which fell instead to the tax farmers<sup>2</sup>. In the sixteenth century the Ottoman state, squeezed financially by an increasing population and rising prices induced by the European price inflation, sought to increase its revenue. One of the measures it adopted was to expand the sale of tax farms<sup>3</sup>. In the eighteenth century the Ottoman government

---

<sup>1</sup> Beldiceanu, *Actes*, II, p.141.

<sup>2</sup> Murat Cızakça, 'Ottoman Economy and Society as Reflected by Tax-Farming Records (16th-18th Centuries)', paper read at the International Symposium on *The State, Decentralisation and Tax-Farming, 1500-1850: The Ottoman Empire, Iran and India* held at Munich 2-5 May 1990, referred to by Halil Berktaş, 'Three Empires and the Societies they Governed: Iran, India and the Ottoman Empire', in *New Approaches to State and Peasant in Ottoman History*, Halil Berktaş and Suraiya Faroqhi, ed, (London, 1992), pp.252-253.

<sup>3</sup> Huri İslamoğlu-İnan and Çağlar Keyder, 'Agenda for Ottoman history' in *The ottoman Empire and the World-Economy*, Huri İslamoğlu-İnan, ed, (Cambridge, 1987), p.56; Immanuel

expanded the use of tax farming as a method of resolving financial problems<sup>1</sup>.

The imposition of a tax farm could also have been a positive stimulant to trade, though it is a system always open to abuse, particularly when the central authority is weakened<sup>2</sup>. If someone bought a tax farm of, for example, customs taxes on certain commodities, it would then be very much in his own interests to encourage the import or export of those commodities as much as possible. In Tunis at the end of the thirteenth century, the Sultan, on discovering how much wine the Venetian tax farmer, Marco Caroso, was handling, took the *gabella* on wine away from him, selling it instead for 10,000 *besants* more, to a Pisan merchant<sup>3</sup>.

As the experience of Marco Caroso shows, a tax farm could have its disadvantages for those who bought it. In 1443 farmers of the tax on wine in Crete were compensated for the losses which they had suffered in the preceding year because

---

Wallerstein, Hale Decdeli and Reşat Kasaba, 'The incorporation of the Ottoman Empire into the world-economy' in *ibid*, p.90.

<sup>1</sup> Ariel Saltzmann, 'An Ancien Regime Revisited: 'Privatization' and Political Economy in the 18th Century Ottoman Empire', forthcoming in *Politics and Society*. I should like to thank Dr Saltzmann for allowing me to see her paper before publication.

<sup>2</sup> For the adverse effect of tax farming on trade in the nineteenth century see Elena Frangakis-Syrett, 'Implementation of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention on Izmir's trade: European and Minority Merchants' in *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no.7, Spring 1992, pp.91-102.

<sup>3</sup> pre 1300 = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.391, pp.393-393.

of the ban imposed on Venetian shipping to the island<sup>1</sup>. In 1388 Checho Bertoldo, who had bought various taxes at auction in Coron, complained that, due to the loss of ships and to the Turkish presence which deterred ships from sailing to Coron, he had lost much income and was thus unable to settle the remaining 200 *ducats* he owed for the tax farm. He was therefore allowed to pay in instalments of 40 *ducats* per annum<sup>2</sup>. Under Mehmed II, however, no leniency was shown to defaulting tax farmers. Various *`âmillers* who did not settle the amounts they had undertaken to pay were put to death<sup>3</sup>. Tax farmers were also on occasion attacked. Three Ragusan merchants who had bought the customs of Srebreniča from the Serbian Despot were attacked, driven out and the customs money and accounts taken<sup>4</sup>.

In conclusion, the *appalto/gabella* was apparently not a monopoly nor a specific tax but a revenue which was farmed out. Its application was extremely wide, being imposed on any commodity, either agricultural or industrial, on tax collection and on production of, for example, copper. The Ottomans often used foreign merchants as tax farmers, thereby availing themselves of the capital and expertise of such merchants, ensuring a fixed income for the state without attendant risks while at the same time creating a climate in

---

<sup>1</sup> 1443.v.27 = Noiret, *Documents*, p.404.

<sup>2</sup> 1388 = *Monumenta Peloponnesica*, no.36.

<sup>3</sup> Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa Livası*, no.3, p.135, no.22, p.152.

<sup>4</sup> 1444.ii.5 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, no.1034, p.336.

which individuals were encouraged to greater activity, so stimulating trade. This Ottoman ability to utilize the skills and money of outside traders may in some way have played a part in the successful early development of the empire. Perhaps, in contrast to other Turkish beyliks of the fourteenth century, the Ottomans grasped the importance of a flourishing economy and of the need to use those who could boost and develop it. As with their policy of using their economic assets in order to obtain a political outcome, banning, for example, the export of such a vital commodity as grain from their territories at the end of the fourteenth century, the Ottomans here too may have been more original in their handling of the economy than their Turkish contemporaries. This is, of course, pure speculation, but it does at least draw attention to the need to understand the economy of the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries as a means of gaining a better understanding of the creation and later success of the Ottoman state.

#### Customs taxes

The most common term used in western sources for customs taxes in western Anatolia is *comerchium* or variants of this while the Ottoman term which appears in documents from the reign of Mehmed II is *gümrük*, defined as a customs-house or a customs-house duty<sup>1</sup>. Other terms applied in western sources

---

<sup>1</sup> Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*.

to what are clearly customs taxes were *dogana*<sup>1</sup>, *solutio*, and *dacia* and *drittus*, both of which are general terms meaning a tax. The Greek term *komerktion*, (Latin *comerchium*), came into use in the Byzantine Empire towards the end of the eighth century and apparently had several meanings, the place where customs was charged or collected, the goods themselves, a market tax, an ad valorem customs tax and a sales tax<sup>2</sup>. In Pegolotti the term appears with three meanings, the customs office, a customs tax and as a sales tax<sup>3</sup>. Jacopo di Promontorio, in his summary of the Sultan's income for 1475, does not always use the term with a great deal of precision. It clearly on occasion means a customs tax. Jacopo refers to the *comerchio* of Gelibolu and Istanbul, of Sofia, of the provinces of Saruhan, Menteşe, Aydın and Balat, of Foça, of Edirne, on foreigners in Bursa, and of Alanya<sup>4</sup>. At other times he seems to use the term to mean simply a tax,

---

<sup>1</sup> 1394.x.6 = Massa, *Alcune Lettere*, no.5, p.358: "i'o pagato per dogana i' Pera f.1"; Badoer, *Libro*, c.40, p.81: "doana de Sargoxa ... doana de Mesina"; Pegolotti, p.15: "doana in tutte terre di Saracini e doana in Cicilia, doana in Napoli e per tutto il regno di Puglia".

<sup>2</sup> Antoniadis-Bibicou, *Douanes*, p.104 fl.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.88: "si vanno <il venditore e> il comperatore insieme al comercio, cioè alla dogana, e fanno scrivere agli scrivani del comercio in presenza del balio del detto comercio le convenenze del mercato che ànno fatto insieme"; *ibid*, p.15 where *comerchio* appears in a list of names used for customs charges: "Tutti quest nomi vogliono dire diritto che si paga di mercatantia e di merce e altre cose che l'uomo mette e trae o passa per li luoghi, paesi, e terre nominatamente detto in questo chiuso"; that it was ad valorem is clear from Pegolotti's phrase "2 per centinaio di ciò che vale la mercatantia", *ibid*, p.41; *ibid*, p.41; "ogni volta che comperi e vendessi nella terra paghi 2 per centinaio".

<sup>4</sup> Jacopo di promontorio, pp.63,65,66,67.

referring to the *comerchio* of animal pastures on *hass* (royal domains or those of the *beylerbeyi* or *sancak beyi*) lands, to the *comerchio* of Negreponte including all *datij*, *gabelle* and *carachio* (ie *haraç*), that of the Morea including *datij* and "royal privileges" ("regalie"), that of Thesaloniki including other "royal privileges" ("regalie") of the salt works ("saline"), that of Enos including the *carachio* (ie *haraç*) of the Greeks living there, the *comerchio* of the salt works ("saline") of Caffa, the *comerchio* of the passage of Chios<sup>1</sup>. On one occasion the term appears to mean *haraç*: "*comerchio di cingali: carachio di quelli di tutte Grecia*" (ie the *haraç* on gypsies in Grecia)<sup>2</sup>. In Kastamonu, Jacopo refers to the *comerchio* on copper, sold *in apalto*<sup>3</sup>. These examples show that the term *commerchio* did not always unequivocally mean a customs tax. Nevertheless, with this proviso, it does seem that in general it was used for a customs levy.

For the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth century the *comerchium* has been described as a combined sales and ad valorem customs tax, paid on a 50-50 basis by the vendor and purchaser<sup>4</sup>. H Antoniadis-Bibicou described the *comerchium* as one single tax made up of two parts, a sales tax and a customs tax<sup>5</sup>. This however seems misleading as it

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, pp.64,66,68.

<sup>2</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, p.65.

<sup>3</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, p.67.

<sup>4</sup> Chrysostomides, 'Venetian Privileges', p.269.

<sup>5</sup> Antoniadis-Bibicou, *Douanes*, p.114: "Désignait-on par le même nom deux impôts différents, ce qui signifierait que les redevables payaient 'deux *kommerkia*', ou, comme pour

was not so much two taxes combined, a sales and a customs, as a customs due, payment of which gave the right to sell<sup>1</sup>. Thus the tax was on occasion levied when no sales were involved, as in the case of customs charged on goods in transit or on goods not sold and re-exported<sup>2</sup>. Under the Ottomans after the fall of Constantinople customs was collected when no sales were involved, being levied, for example, on non off-loaded cargoes<sup>3</sup>. When the sale of goods

---

l'octava, s'agit-il d'un seul et meme impot, le *kommerkion*, composé de driots de douane et de droits de vente? A mon avis, il n'y a pas de doute; la bonne réponse est la seconde."

<sup>1</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio talks of the *comerchio* of Gelibolu being paid in full by everyone except the Turks who only paid if they sold by weight, at a rate of 1 asper per *kantar*. This could be taken as a clear indication of the sales element in the *commerchium*. But it is odd therefore that the rate given is per weight not ad valorem. There is the futher problem of Jacopo's imprecision in his use of the term *comerchio*. It does seem from context that what the Turks paid was not *comerchium*, in the sense of a customs levy, but a weight tax.

<sup>2</sup> The Byzantine Emperor refused to grant Ragusan merchants the privilege of re-exporting from Constantinople without paying customs on merchandise which they had not been able to sell there, 1451.v.11 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik* no.1217, pp.371-372. Sometimes, of course, customs was charged only on goods sold. Under a clause in the 1320 treaty between the Venetians and the Mongols, the Venetians were to pay the customs official on what they sold, Mas Latrie, 'Privilège commercial accordé en 1320', clause 4.

<sup>3</sup> After 1453 Muslim and tributary merchants in Istanbul and Mudanya paid customs if they took their unsold goods away by sea, post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 2, p.118. In 1481 Frankish merchants were charged customs on unsold goods they took away by sea as were merchants exporting unsold goods by sea from Samsun and Sinop in the following year, 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 3, pp.151-152. Customs were charged on unsold goods off-loaded in Istanbul and Galata from ships arriving from Genoa or Frankish lands, post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.37, clause 2, p.118, on goods in various



was involved customs was not always paid 50-50 by vendor and purchaser<sup>1</sup>.

The *comerchium* could apparently be paid at various times, differing according to who was paying. In Constantinople in the early fourteenth century Florentines, Provençals, Catalans, Anconitans, Sicilians and other foreigners had to pay the import and the export tax at the same time on entry<sup>2</sup>. This also applied in 1320 to Bachelonese

---

ports including Istanbul, Galata, Gelibolu, Mudanya and ports to the borders of Aydın ili off-loaded from ships from Genoa and Venice, post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.35, p.47; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.36, clause 2, p.113, unsold goods off-loaded from ships again from Genoa and Venice in 1481 and on those off-loaded in Samsun and Sinop in the following year, 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 3, pp.151-152. Wine in the Ottoman empire after 1453 was taxed regardless of sale, post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.37, clause 2, p.118; Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.35, p.49; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.36, clause 10, p.115; 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.53, pp.74-75; *ibid*, no.54, clause 8, p.147; 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.56, clause 6, pp.151-2; 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, pp.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 5, p.153. In 1476 merchants in various ports including Istanbul, Galata, Gelibolu, Mudanya and ports to the borders of Aydın ili, did not pay customs if they bought goods but did not export them, post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.35, p.48; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.36, clause 8, p.115. 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.54, clause 52, p.147.

<sup>1</sup> In 1450 Thomas Živolinović bought cloth from Franko Crijević in Ragusa. Crijević was to pay the customs on the cloth and export it on a Ragusan ship to Arta. There Živolinović was to supply Crijević with goods and to pay 379 ducats, which seems to have been the price of the cloth (368 ducats) plus the customs charge (at marginally over 3%), there being 32 pieces of cloth worth 11.5 ducats each. 1450.xi.2 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, no.1191, p.365.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.41.

merchants in Constantinople<sup>1</sup>. In 1431 the Ragusan government asked Constantine Palaeologos, Despot of the Morea, to confirm various privileges including that of paying customs only once either on entry or exit. In the government's letter reference is made to merchants trading in the Despot's lands in silk and other merchandise paying 3% customs only once, either on entry or exit<sup>2</sup>.

Various factors seem to have affected the imposition of the *comerchium* in Turchia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries one, of which was whether the goods to be taxed were off-loaded. It seems that in the case of ships importing goods into western Anatolia, customs was charged on off-loaded goods rather than on the cargo as a whole. Clauses in the treaties between Menteşe and Venice specify that if any merchant unloaded his goods in the land of the beylik and could not sell them, he could take them elsewhere by land, paying customs only once, indicating that what was charged was off-loaded goods<sup>3</sup>. That only off-loaded goods were subject to customs seems to have been the case in Constantinople in the early part of the fourteenth century for Pegolotti refers to goods "che mettono in Gostantinopoli" being charged customs<sup>4</sup>. In Ragusa goods which remained on

---

<sup>1</sup> de Capmany, *Barcelona*, II, p.84.

<sup>2</sup> 1431.ii.16 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, no.787, p.293.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.pre iv = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 14, p.197; 1375.x.13 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 14, p.221; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, doc.1403M DVL, clause 14, p.229; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid* doc.1407M, clause 14, p.236.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.41.

board ship were apparently exempt from customs, for when permission was granted to Jannus Calopita of Corfu to enter the port of Ragusa and to sell his goods there, the two *botta* of Malmsey wine which were on board his ship and which he wished to take elsewhere, were to remain sealed on the ship and could be re-exported without paying customs<sup>1</sup>. Under the Ottomans in the latter part of the fifteenth century off-loaded cargoes were charged customs<sup>2</sup>. A regulation from the reign of Mehmed II specifies that if a ship declared its cargo in Istanbul and paid customs and then anchored in Gelibolu or Mudanya, it was to pay no further customs charges. But if it loaded or off-loaded any goods, it was to pay

---

<sup>1</sup> 1445.xii.24 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, no.1095, p.346.

<sup>2</sup> In a document from the reign of Mehmed II of customs regulations in Gelibolu, ships which off-loaded at Bolayır, Aklıman or outside Kavak were to pay customs to the *âmiller*, and customs was levied on ships off-loading anywhere between Eceovası and Tekirdağ, no date (reign of Mehmed II) = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.45, p.64; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.46, clause 13, p.136. The Ottoman word used is *çıkarmak*. The same verb is used throughout the documents, sometimes in the phrase *gemiden taşra çıkar* or *taşra çıkar*. This applied also in 1476, 1476.i.14 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.33, p.44; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.33; c.1476.i.14 = *ibid*, no.33, p.44; *ibid*, no.34, clause 3, pp.110-111. Customs in Galata, Istanbul, Gelibolu, Mudanya and ports to the borders of Aydın ili was charged on goods off-loaded from ships arriving from Frankish lands, Venice and Genoa, post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.36, p.49; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.37, clause 2, p.116. This document also gives the customs rate for cloth unloaded either on the Rumeli or Anadolu coast on the Istanbul side of Gelibolu; post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.35, p.47; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.36, clause 2, p.113. 1476.i/ii = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.54, clause 2, p.146. 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.55, pp.78-9; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.56, clause 1, p.151. In 1482 customs charges were levied at Samsun and Sinop on goods off-loaded from ships from Venice, Rum and other infidel "vilayets", 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, pp.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 2, p.152.

customs on the goods off-loaded<sup>1</sup>. Off-loading however, was not always a criterion for customs imposition in the later part of the fifteenth century, for wine imported into the empire was sometimes to be taxed customs whether it was off-loaded or not<sup>2</sup> and sometimes after off-loading<sup>3</sup>.

There was on occasion, from a customs point of view, no significant difference between off-loading and dropping anchor. Under the 1476 regulation for customs in ports including Istanbul, Galata, Gelibolu, Mudanya and ports to the borders of Aydın ili, ships off-loading were charged customs, as were those anchoring<sup>4</sup>. Other post 1453 documents refer to ships dropping anchor and being liable for customs<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.35, p.48; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clause 9, p.115.

<sup>2</sup> Post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 3, p.118. Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.35, p.49; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.36, clause 10, p.115.

<sup>3</sup> 1476.i/ii = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, pp.74-5; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.54, clause 8, p.147; 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.56, clause 6, pp.151-2; 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, pp.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 5, p.153.

<sup>4</sup> 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.54, clause 2, p.146: "Firenk'den ve Venedik'den ve Cineviz'den ve gayrından gemi gelüb metā'ın mezkūr yerlerde taşra çıkarak olursa .....gümrük alına"; Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, p.74; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, clause 6, p.147: "Ağdeniz'den ve Karadeniz'den ki bir gemi gelse, lenger atsa, `ādet üzre gümrük vere, eger lenger atmayup giderse nesne vermeye".

<sup>5</sup> All ships arriving from Frankish lands and anchoring in Istanbul, Gelibolu or Mudanya were to pay customs on their goods, post 1476.i.28 = Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clause 9, p.115. This clause is missing in the document in Anhegger and İnalçık. Again in 1476, ships coming from the Mediterranean or the Black Sea which dropped anchor in ports including Istanbul, Galata, Gelibolu, Mudanya and ports to

In 1476 any ship which came from the Mediterranean or the Black Sea and dropped anchor at Istanbul, Mudanya or Gelibolu, was to pay customs on its cargo<sup>1</sup>. Sometimes, however, anchoring ships were not subject to customs. If a ship, because of necessity, put into harbour and dropped anchor for a few days but did not load or off-load goods, then no customs were to be charged. But if the ship put in and dropped anchor for more than a few days and of its own volition, then it was to pay full customs<sup>2</sup>. There does not seem to be evidence for the position in the fourteenth century over customs imposition on anchoring ships though it seems possible to suggest that it was similar to that which applied later.

For customs purposes, a distinction was made between unsold goods which were transported elsewhere within the state by land, and those which were taken away by sea. In Aydın, under the 1337 treaty, the merchants were able to transport unsold merchandise elsewhere by land without any tax payment, Aydın at that time imposing no import levy on

---

the borders of Aydın ili, were to pay customs. If the ships did not drop anchor but sailed on, customs was not levied, 1476.i/2 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, no.54, clause 6, p.147.

<sup>1</sup> Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.35, p.48; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clause 9, p.115: "Akdeniz'den ve Karadeniz'den ki bir gemi Istanbul'a yahud Mudanya'ya yahud Gelibolu'ya gelüb lenger atsa, gemi yükünün tamam gümrüğün vere".

<sup>2</sup> Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.35, p.48; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clause 9, p.115.

Venetian merchants<sup>1</sup>. No mention is made of goods taken out by sea. Venetian merchants could transport by land elsewhere within Menteşe goods they had been unable to sell without paying any further import tax<sup>2</sup>. Those Venetians entering Menteşe with goods they did not intend to sell were able to leave again by sea without paying any import tax<sup>3</sup>. It is possible that this was a concession granted only to Venice and that goods leaving by sea were usually charged regardless of whether they were or were not sold, for under the Ottomans after 1453 in Istanbul and Galata, Muslim and tributary merchants paid no customs if they did not sell their goods and left with them by land. If however they took their unsold goods away by sea, they were charged customs tax<sup>4</sup>. In 1481 Frankish merchants could take goods they had not sold away by land without paying customs but were taxed if they took them by sea<sup>5</sup>. This applied too in 1482 in Samsun and

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A clause 13, pp.192-193

<sup>2</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M clause 3, p.187, states specifically that tax was to be levied only once even if goods were taken to more than one place; 1337.pre iv = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 14, p.197; 1375.x.13 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 14, p.221; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, doc.1403M DVL, clause 14, p.229; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid* doc.1407M, clause 14, p.236.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.pre iv = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 13, p.197; 1353.iv.7 = *ibid*, doc.1353A, clause 13, p.213; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 13, p.221; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, doc.1403M DVL, clause 13, p.229; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 13, p.236.

<sup>4</sup> Post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 2, p.118.

<sup>5</sup> 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.56, clause 2, p.151. It seems that the merchandise meant here was cloth.

Sinop<sup>1</sup>. The exemption from customs on unsold goods removed by land, while those removed by sea were charged, was perhaps due to the fact that if the merchants took their unsold goods by land, they could be expected to try and sell them at some other market within Ottoman jurisdiction and would therefore be liable to customs elsewhere within the empire. Perhaps the unpopularity of being made to pay customs on unsold goods in one market, only to have to pay again on the same goods in another market, may have had some influence. If, however, the merchant left with his goods by sea, he might well have been sailing out of the empire and would therefore escape paying any Ottoman customs at all.

There was a similar situation in Cyprus in the early fourteenth century. In Cyprus, if a merchant off-loaded his goods onto land and without selling them wished to take them out of the island, he paid the 2% entry customs but nothing on export. If the merchant took his goods from one part of Cyprus by sea to another part, he paid tax as if exporting, but if he took them by land, he paid no customs<sup>2</sup>.

On the other hand, it may be that the emirs of Menteşe and Aydın did not generally charge on goods which the merchants did not wish or were unable to sell while the Ottomans in the fifteenth century charged regardless of

---

<sup>1</sup> 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.57, clause 3, pp.152-153.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.84.

sales<sup>1</sup>. It is therefore possible that the imposition of a customs levy regardless of whether goods were or were not sold is a reflection of the increased strength of the empire.

Another factor in the imposition of customs dues was transit trade. Goods in transit do not appear as chargeable items in the treaties between Menteşe, Aydın and Venice, apart from the clauses exempting them from paying more than once if they were unsold. Interestingly the 1387 treaty between Murad I and the Genoese does contain a clause exempting the Ottomans or their agents from paying tax on goods they took into and out of Pera, presumably in transit<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Goods off-loaded in Istanbul and Galata from ships arriving from Frankish lands or Genoa, were to pay customs whether they were sold or not. The same was true of goods transferred there from one ship to another, post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, p.49; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 2, p.116. Merchants were charged customs in various ports including Istanbul, Galata, Gelibolu, Mudanya and ports to the borders of Aydın ili, on the goods they off-loaded from ships arriving from Venice, Genoa and other places regardless of whether the goods were sold, post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.35, p.47; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, no.36, clause 2, p.113; 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.54, clause 2, p.146. Off-loaded goods from ships from Genoa and Venice were charged in 1481 regardless of sale, as they were the following year in Sinop and Samsun, 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.55, pp.78-79; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.56, clause 1, p.151; 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 2, p.152. Wine was taxed regardless of whether it was for sale or for personal consumption, post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.37, clause -, p.118; post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.35, p.49; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.36, clause 10, p.115; 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.53, pp.74-75; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.54, clause 8, p.147; 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.56, clause 6, pp.151-152; 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 5, p.153.

<sup>2</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segretto, Materie Politiche 2729. no.26; Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 3, p.14.



There is no similar clause in this treaty exempting the Genoese from taxes on goods in transit in Ottoman lands, an absence which, in conjunction with the silence of the other treaties on transit taxes, might lead one to presume that goods in transit in western Anatolia at this period were not taxed. It is possible that, at least on occasion, this applied also in the later period for under Mehmed II goods were exempt from tax if they were on ships in transit<sup>1</sup>.

Transit goods however were taxed in Cyprus in the early fourteenth century. If a merchant transferred goods from one ship to another in the port of Famagusta without off-loading onto land in order to send them out of Cyprus, he only paid 1% in toto for entry and exit<sup>2</sup>. Merchants who off-loaded goods in transit only at Ragusa were to pay a tax of 1%. But if the merchants with goods in transit were from, among other places, Bulgaria, Serbia, Bosnia and Hungary, where Ragusans paid customs, then they were to pay 3% also for goods in transit<sup>3</sup>. In 1261 Venetians in transit in Lesser Armenia paid according to custom<sup>4</sup>. According to the 1236 agreement between Cyprus and King Henri II, those bringing goods in transit to Cyprus from Seljuk lands paid various rates: one

---

<sup>1</sup> Post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, p.50; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 4, p.118.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.84: "si none paghi se none uno per centinaio in somma tra d'entrata e d'uscita".

<sup>3</sup> 1353.vi.3 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, no.376, pp.225-6.

<sup>4</sup> 1261.xi. = Mas Latrie, 'Privilège accordé par Héthoum Ier Roi d'Arménie, aux Vénitiens, en 1261', in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, vol. XXXI (1870), (Paris, 1871), p.409.

gold *bessant* for one *kantar* of alum, two *bessants* per *kantar* of wool, one and a half *bessants* for one bale of silk or silk cloth and one *bessant* for each *kantar* of any other commodity<sup>1</sup>.

After 1453, goods transferred from one ship to another were taxed. Merchants were charged in Istanbul and Galata on goods transferred from one ship coming from Frankish lands and Genoa to another<sup>2</sup> as were goods transferred from one ship to another in Istanbul, Galata, Gelibolu and various other ports including those from Yoros to the borders of Aydın ili<sup>3</sup>. In 1481 and 1482 ships transferring goods paid customs<sup>4</sup>. This taxing of transferred goods does not appear in the pre-1453 documents. The reason for this could be that such goods were not taxed, possibly due to a very small amount of transferring at ports under Turkish control before that date. As presumably Istanbul and Galata were the most important transit ports in the area where it would be reasonable to assume that goods were constantly transferred from one ship to another, this might be the explanation. If so this indicates that with conquest of Constantinople the

---

<sup>1</sup> Méry, *Marseille*, I, pp.419-421.

<sup>2</sup> Post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, p.49; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 2, p.116.

<sup>3</sup> Post 1476.1.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.35, p.47; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clause 3, p.114; 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, clause 3, p.146.

<sup>4</sup> 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.55, p.78; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.56, clause 1, p.151; 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 2, p.152.

Ottomans increased not only their customs income but instantly increased their customs taking ability.

In Turchia in the fourteenth century there were various types of customs charges, those imposed on all goods, unspecified, and those levied on particular merchandise. In approximately the 1320s Aydın charged no import duty but an export tax on unspecified goods of either 6% or 4% for Venetians<sup>1</sup>. Menteşe imposed an import and an export duty of 2% each on Venetian merchants<sup>2</sup> while in Antalya, Cypriots paid 2% on both imports and exports. The Bardi company paid 2% on imports but were exempted from any export charges<sup>3</sup>. In the same period in Constantinople Genoese and Venetian merchants paid no entry or exit customs, Pisans, Florentines, Provençals, Catalans, Anconitans, Sicilians and other foreigners paid 2% entry and 2% exit customs charges. In Pera, Pisans paid the same as they did in Constantinople<sup>4</sup>. In 1320 Barcelonese merchants paid 2% entry and 2% exit customs in Constantinople<sup>5</sup>. In Cyprus Borghesi of Famagusta, Genoese and Venetians paid no entry or exit customs, Pisans, Narbonese, Provençals, Catalans, Anconitans, the Bardi and Peruzzi Companies paid 2% entry and 2% exit tax. Florentines

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.55-7; 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 13, pp.192-193 (imports), *ibid*, clause 7, p.191 (6% on goods measured by *seruch*), *ibid* (4% on goods not measured by *seruch*).

<sup>2</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.41.

<sup>5</sup> de Capmanay, *Barcelona*, II, p.84.

paid 4% entry and 4% exit until 1324 when they were granted the concession of paying 2% entry and 2% exit, the concession becoming permanent in 1327. All others not granted a concession by the King of Cyprus paid 4% entry and 4% exit customs<sup>1</sup>. Under the 1236 agreement between Cyprus and King Henri those bringing goods into Cyprus from Seljuk lands and selling them were to pay a tax of 1%<sup>2</sup>. The 2% export and 2% import charge remained the same in Menteşe into the fifteenth century<sup>3</sup>. In Aydın however the rate changed and in 1353 both imports and exports were charged for Venetians at 2%<sup>4</sup>.

Under the Ottomans it is not known what customs rates were charged during this period. The treaty between Murad I and the Genoese enacted in 1387 gives no rate but refers to customs as being paid by the Genoese according to custom<sup>5</sup>. It seems reasonable to assume that certainly in the first half of the fourteenth century, or perhaps until the beginning of the reign of Murad I, the Ottomans charged customs rates similar to those imposed in the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın as in this period the Ottomans were not

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.83-84.

<sup>2</sup> Méry, *Marseille*, I, pp.419-421.

<sup>3</sup> 1375.iv.22 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1375M, clause 21, p.222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, clause 21, pp.230-1; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 20, p.236; 1414.x.17 = *ibid*, doc.1414M, clause 3, p.238 states that the *comerchium* on import and export was to be paid as it had been in the past.

<sup>4</sup> 1353.iv.7 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1353A, clause 20, p.214.

<sup>5</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segretto, Materie Politiche 2729. no.26; Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 5, p.15.

significantly more powerful than their neighbours, although of course their power was very much on the increase. Thus perhaps one might suggest that the Ottomans charged Latins, such as the Genoese and Venetians, a general rate of something in the region of 2% on both imports and exports, in line with that charged in Menteşe, in Aydın under the 1353 treaty, and for Cypriots in Antalya.

Later on in the century however it would seem more reasonable to assume that as the empire became increasingly more important, so its ability to charge a higher customs rate correspondingly increased. This must presumably apply to the reign of Bayezid I under whom the empire annexed both Aydın and Menteşe. Thus in the period of the reigns of Murad I and Bayezid I and before the collapse of 1402 one may suggest an increase in customs rates for Latins from a possible rate of 2% to something less than 5%, this figure being the highest of those customs rates recorded in documents from the reign of Mehmed II. It would seem very unlikely that the Ottoman Empire at the end of the fourteenth century would have been able to charge higher rates than the considerably more powerful empire of one hundred years later.

Under the treaty of 1403 made by Süleyman the rates again appear as those paid according to custom<sup>1</sup>. This presumably means that the rates were unaltered from the reign of Bayezid I. This is in itself interesting for it thus appears that the European section of the now fragmented empire was able to avoid making any concessions over customs

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403 = Dennis, '1403', p.79.

charges, although Süleyman was very much looking for outside support against his brothers in the internecine struggle for overall control of the whole empire. Under these circumstances one would perhaps have expected some concessions over tax rates. In any case the rate, if unaltered from the reign of Bayezid I, was presumably more than 2% but less than 5%. It would again seem feasible that the customs rates charged by the Ottomans were again raised once the empire was firmly re-established and once more advancing. Therefore the amounts levied under Murad II could well have been higher than those of Mehmed I. The customs rate was perhaps between 4% and 5% for 4% was charged on Muslims and tributaries while non-tributaries were not to pay more than 5% " `adet üzere" (according to custom) in Gelibolu at some time during the reign of Mehmed II<sup>1</sup>. " `adet üzere" may here refer to what was charged by the previous sultan. The rate of 4% for Muslims and tributaries, and 5% for non-tributary Franks and other infidels appears also in a document dating from after January 1476<sup>2</sup> and in one from January or February of that year<sup>3</sup>.

Although it seems reasonable to assume that there was an increase in customs charges during the period between the early fourteenth century and the fall of Constantinople, that

---

<sup>1</sup> no date = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.45, p.63; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.46, clause 9, p.135.

<sup>2</sup> Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.35, pp.47-48; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clauses 2,3,4, pp.113-114.

<sup>3</sup> 1476.i/ii = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.54, clauses 2,3, p.146.

is a gradual rise from the 2% charged in the beyliks to the 5% charged under Mehmed II, customs rates given by Giacomo Badoer for the Ottoman empire in the late 1430s, lead one to question this, or at least to explain his figures. A *comerchium* of 2% was charged in Gelibolu in 1437 and 1438<sup>1</sup>. The same figure was levied in Edirne<sup>2</sup>. In 1437 the import customs ("comerchio de intrada") at Samsun (Simiso) was 2%<sup>3</sup>.

Thus, while under Mehmed II, the customs charge on infidels and non-tributaries in Gelibolu was, "*`adet üzre*", not more than 5%<sup>4</sup>, it was, in the reign of his father, 2%. The figures can either be explained by accepting that there was no change in customs charges for over 100 years, despite a very much altered political position, and that after 1453 there was a substantial rise in charges, or that these figures represent a generous concession granted to favoured western merchants, such as the Genoese and the Venetians. The latter explanation seems more feasible. That certain westerners were granted favourable trade terms is clear and that they might have been granted a concession of 2% or 3% seems possible. The figures might lead one to suggest that

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.ii.17, 1437.viii.5 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.175, p.352, c.125, p.253, on "*veli crespi*" (crape); 1438.ix.18 = *ibid*, c.247, p.496, c.175, p.353, on wool; 1438.viii.5 = *ibid*, c.191, p.384, c.175, p.353, on wax ("*zera*").

<sup>2</sup> 1437.iv.30 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.57, p.114, c.43, p.87, on "*veli crespi*"; 1438.viii.18 = *ibid*, c.230, p.462, c.89, p.181, on "*veli*" (muslin); 1439.iii.12 = *ibid*, c.319, p.640, c.244, p.491, on "*damascin biancho*".

<sup>3</sup> 1436.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.152, p.306, c.44, p.89.

<sup>4</sup> no date = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.45, p.63; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.46, clause 9, p.135.

under Murad II the usual customs charge on Latins was nearer 4% than the 5% under his successor, so making the rates quoted in Badoer for the latter part of the 1430s a concession of 2%. In the early 1480s tributaries were charged at 2% in contrast with the 4% levied on non-Muslims and non-tributaries<sup>1</sup>. Perhaps western merchants such as the Genoese and Venetians were, in the 1430s, granted rates in line with those levied on tributaries in the early 1480s.

The customs rates discussed so far were all charges imposed on various groups of Latins. Other charges were presumably levied on Muslims or tributaries since documents from the reign of Mehmed II distinguish between rates charged to Muslims and those to tributaries and to non-tributaries. As there does not appear to be any extant material on rates for unspecified goods imposed on other groups of merchants in Turchia during this period, the only possible way of suggesting such rates is to look at those charged in the later fifteenth century for which we have records. In Gelibolu at some stage during the reign of Mehmed II Muslims and tributaries were charged at 4% and non-tributaries at not more than 5% on both imports and exports<sup>2</sup>. In 1475, according to the income given by Jacopo di Promontorio, foreigners paid in Gelibolu and Istanbul 5% customs on both

---

<sup>1</sup> 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.55, pp.78-79; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.56, pp.151-152; 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *ibid*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *ibid*, no.57, clause 2, p.152.

<sup>2</sup> no date = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.45, p.63; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.46, clause 9, p.135.



imports and exports while subjects of the Sultan paid 4%<sup>1</sup>. At some time after January 1476 Muslims and tributaries were charged in various ports including Istanbul, Galata, Gelibolu and those ports along the coast to the borders of Aydınili including Çeşme and the two Phokaeas, 4% on imports while non-tributary Franks and other infidels paid 5%<sup>2</sup>. This 4%/5% differential applied also to goods transferred from one ship to another, to cloth, grain, other foodstuffs and spices. The same rates appear in a document from the beginning of 1476 for the same areas where again Muslims and tributaries paid 4% on imports and non-tributary Franks and other infidels paid 5%. This also applied to goods transferred from one ship to another<sup>3</sup>. In 1481 non-Muslims and non-tributaries paid 4% on imported goods and on merchandise transferred from one ship to another, tributaries 2% and Muslims 1%<sup>4</sup>. The same grading of customs rates also applied to cloth<sup>5</sup> and to goods in general in Samsun and Sinop in 1482<sup>6</sup>. Thus for most of the reign of Mehmed II there was a difference of 1% in customs levied on Muslims and tributaries

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, p.63.

<sup>2</sup> Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.35, pp.47-48; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clauses 2,3,4. pp.11-14.

<sup>3</sup> 1476.i.28/ii.16 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.54, clauses 2,3, p.146.

<sup>4</sup> 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.55, pp.78-79; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.56, pp.151-152.

<sup>5</sup> 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.56, clause 1, p.151.

<sup>6</sup> 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.57, clause 2, p.152.

on the one hand and non-tributaries on the other. After 1481 the ratio changes to a 3% difference between what Latins and Muslims paid, with tributaries in the middle. It would therefore seem possible that a differential of 1% applied to rates for Latins and for Muslims in the period before 1453. If this is correct, then perhaps during the fourteenth century Latins paid an import-export tax of 2% and Muslims of 1%. This ratio would have changed as the customs levied rose so that by the reign of Murad II the rate was perhaps 4% for Latins and 3% for Muslims. However the 1387 treaty between Murad I and the Genoese granted the same customs charges on grain for the Genoese as that paid by Arabs, (or Muslims), Greeks, Venetians and others who were granted a reduced rate<sup>1</sup>. Later, in either 1454-63 or 1479-81, a rate of 3% on cloth imported into Bursa was levied on Muslims, tributaries and infidel merchants from Venice, Genoa, Chios and other places<sup>2</sup>. Therefore this division of rates between Muslims and non-Muslims did not always apply. A differential rate of 1% existed in Tana in the early fourteenth century when the Genoese and Venetians paid 4% on wine, oxhides, sturgeon and dressed horsehides while all others paid 5%<sup>3</sup>. In the same period in Constantinople the differential was wider. Genoese

---

<sup>1</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segretto, Materie Politiche 2729, no.26; Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 5, p.15.

<sup>2</sup> 1454-63 or 1479-81 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no. 30, pp.40-41; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no. 31, clause 2, p.104.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.24. The rate of 4% was charged in Tana in 1438 on honey, 1438.xii.29 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.283, p.568, c.219, p.441.

and Venetian merchants paid nothing, Pisans, Florentines, Provençals, Catalans, Sicilians, Barcelonese and others paid 2% entry and 2% exit customs<sup>1</sup>. In Cyprus the Borghesi of Famagusta, the Genoese and the Venetians paid nothing on entry or exit, Pisans, Narbonese, Provençals, Catalans, Anconitans and the Bardi and Peruzzi Companies paid customs of 2% entry and 2% exit, while Florentines paid 4% entry and 4% exit until 1324 when King of Cyprus granted them the concession of paying 2%, the concession being made permanent in 1327. All others paid customs of 4% entry and 4% exit<sup>2</sup>.

Special customs dues were charged on specified commodities, both imports and exports. For Professor Zachariadou these rates on specified commodities were charged in addition to the standard customs dues on non-specified goods<sup>3</sup>. It appears possible however that these rates alone were levied on the goods specified and were not in fact in addition to the standard customs charges<sup>4</sup>. A clause in the treaty of 1331 between Menteşe and Crete seems to support this. Venetians were to pay "duo pro centinario de omnibus mercibus quas illuc mercatores portabunt et similiter de omnibus mercibus quas inde extrahent duo pro centinario, excepto commercio et solutione bladi et leguminum, bobum, equorum et sclavorum. Et de frumento debeant solvere aspros

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.41; de Capmany, *Barcelona*, II, p.84.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.84.

<sup>3</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, pp.154, 156, 157.

<sup>4</sup> Zhukov, *Эгейские Эмираты*, p.83, also argues that when specified commodities were charged special duties, the 2% export duty was not imposed.

duos pro modio et de ordeo et legumine asprum unum pro modio et de bove aspros duos, de equos aspros tres et de sclavo aspros decem pro quolibet predictorum"<sup>1</sup>. From this it seems that grain, vegetables, livestock and slaves were not charged at the standard customs rate of 2% but paid their own special rates. It does not seem that these commodities were charged 2% plus an additional extra customs charge. Further in the 1403 treaty between Menteşe and Crete, clause 20 lists the tax on grain, vegetables, horses, cattle, asses and slaves while clause 21 states that 2% is to be charged on all other goods. This also gives the clear impression that those charges imposed on specified commodities were separate from and not in addition to the 2% customs charge<sup>2</sup>. In calculating customs charges on specified goods I have therefore worked on the assumption that those charges specified in the extant documents represent the entire amount due without the addition of the standard rate quoted on non-specified goods.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, no.1331M, clause 3, p.187.

<sup>2</sup> 1403.vii.24 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1403M, doc.1403M, DVL, clauses 20, 21, pp.230-231.

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA C.1310-1340								
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
1 gold florin per botte de Napoli	Aydin	-	Tax farmer	import	Latins ?	wine		Pegolotti, pp.55-56
none	"	-	"	"	"	all goods except soap and wine		ibid
4%	"	-	-	export	"	all goods except wax		ibid
4%	"	-	-	"	"	grain (?)	to be paid to the Lord of Theologos	ibid
2%	"	-	-	"	"	wax		ibid
2 gold florins per 23.5 batman or per kantar of Cyprus or if in a sack	"	-	-	import	"	soap		ibid
1 gold florin per cassa	"	-	-	"	"	soap		ibid
2%	Antalya	-	-	"	Cypriots	all goods		ibid, pp.57-58
2%	"	-	-	export	"	all goods		ibid
2%	"	-	-	import	Bardi Co.	all goods		ibid

none	"	-	-	export	"	all goods		ibid
6 aspers peroggio	"	-	-	"	Latins ?	grain		ibid

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA IN 1331									
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE	
2%	Menteşe	-	-	import	Venetians	all goods		Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187	
2%	"	-	-	export	"			ibid	
2 <u>aspers</u> per <u>modio</u> (comerclum)	"	-	-	"	"	grain		ibid	
1 <u>asper</u> per <u>modio</u>	"	-	-	"	"	barley, pulses		ibid	
2 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	cattle		ibid	
3 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	horses		ibid	
10 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	slaves		ibid	
- (comerchium vel dacia)	"	-	-	"	"	-	only to be paid once even if the good were taken to more than one place	ibid	

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA IN 1337									
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE	
none ( <u>dacium</u> )	Aydin	-	-	import	Venetians	all goods except soap and wine		1337.111.9 = <u>Zachariadou, Trade</u> <u>and Crusade.</u> doc.1337A, clause 7, p.191	
2 pieces of soap per <u>cassia</u> or 2 <u>stavrate</u>	"	-	-	"	"	soap		ibid	
1 florin per <u>vesete</u> <u>de Neapoli</u>	"	-	-	"	"	wine		ibid	
6%	"	-	-	export	"	all goods measured by the <u>seruch</u>		ibid	
4%	"	-	-	"	"	all goods not measured by the <u>seruch</u>		ibid	
none ( <u>comercium</u> )	"	sea	-	"	"	water and victuals	any Venetian ship could buy water and victuals "ob suam monetam" without paying <u>comercium</u>	ibid, clause 10, p.192	



none ( <u>drittus</u> )	"	"	-	import	"	all goods	brought in by Venetians for sale	ibid. clause 13. pp.192-193
none ( <u>comercium</u> , <u>drittus</u> )	"	land	-	"	"	all goods	if Venetians brought in goods but did not sell them they could take them by land to other places for sale without paying <u>comercium</u> or <u>drittus</u>	ibid
none ( <u>comercium</u> , <u>drittus</u> )	"	sea	-	import export	"	all goods	if a Venetians ship, due to storm or attack, was shipwrecked, the Venetians could sell their goods or take them out without paying <u>comercium</u> or <u>drittus</u>	ibid. clause 15, p.193
none ( <u>comercium</u> )	Menteşe	"	-	import	"	all goods	if Venetians came but did not wish to sell	1337.pre.iv = Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade. doc.1337M, clause 13, p.197

2%	"	land	-	"	"	all goods	if Venetians off-loaded goods but could not sell them and wanted to go by land to other places, they were to pay 2% only once for the whole of the beylik	ibid, clause 14, p.197
none ( <u>comercium</u> )	"	sea	-	export	"	food, meat, bread	if Venetian ships bought food " <u>cum eorum pecunia</u> " no <u>comercium</u> was to be paid	ibid, clause 19, p.198
2 <u>aspers</u> per modio	"	-	-	"	"	grain		ibid, clause 20, p.198
1 <u>aspers</u> per modio	"	-	-	"	"	barley, legumes		ibid
3 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	horses		ibid
2 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	cattle, asses		ibid
10 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	slaves		ibid
2%	"	-	-	import	"	all goods		ibid, clause 21, p.198
2%	"	-	-	export	"	all goods		ibid

50 aspers per vegete	"	-	tax farmer	-	"	wine	on the basis of this rate, to be paid per <u>caratello</u> ("et sic pro ratione solvatur pro caratello")	ibid, clause 22, p.198
-------------------------	---	---	---------------	---	---	------	---	---------------------------

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA IN 1348									
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE	
? (comercium)	Aydin	-	Government	-	Latins		undertaking not to increase <u>comercium</u> "quod pertinent dominationis"	1438.viii.18 = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1348A, clause 17, p.209	
none (comercium)	2	sea	-	-	"	bread, meat, wine, all victuals	ships could buy and sell all that was necessary for refreshment	ibid, clause 19, p.209	

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA IN 1353

TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
none ( <u>comercium</u> )	Aydin	sea	-	import , export	Latins	bread, meat, wine, all victuals	Venetian ships were able to buy and sell all that was necessary for refreshment without <u>comercium</u>	1353.iv.7 = Zachariadou, Trade and <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1353a, clause 9, p.213
none ( <u>comercium</u> )	"	"	-	import	"	all goods	if Venetian ships were shipwrecked because of storms or attack, they could sell what goods they wished or to take their goods out without paying <u>comercium</u>	ibid, clause 10, p.213
none ( <u>comercium</u> )	"	"	-	-	"	all goods	if merchants brought in goods but did not want to sell them, they could take them elsewhere by sea without paying <u>comercium</u>	ibid, clause 13, p.213
none ( <u>comercium</u> )	"	-	-	export	"	food, meat	Venetian ships could take food, meat or any victuals "cum denariis suis" without paying <u>comercium</u>	ibid, clause 18, p.214
4%	"	-	"		"	grain, other victuals, legumes		ibid, clause 19, p.214

?	"	-	-	-	"	"	slaves, animals	rates as paid by the Rhodians and the Genoese	ibid
2%	"	-	-	import	"	"	all goods	"	ibid, clause 20, p.214
2%	"	-	-	export	"	"	all goods		ibid
1 florin per buta de mena	"	-	-	-	"	"	wine		ibid
5 ciliatos per capsa	"	-	-	-	"	"	soap		ibid

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA IN 1375								
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
none (comercium)	Mentese	sea	-	import	Venetians	all goods	if Venetians brought in goods and did not want to sell them they could go elsewhere by sea without paying <u>comercium</u>	1375.iv.22 = Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade, doc.1375M, clause 13, p.221
2%	"	land	-	"	"	all goods	if Venetians off-loaded, could not sell and wanted to go elsewhere by land, they were to pay 2% only once	ibid, clause 14, p.221
none (comercium)	"	-	-	-	"	food, meat, bread	Venetian ships could take victuals without paying <u>comercium</u>	ibid, clause 19, p.221
2 aspers per modio	"	-	-	export	"	grain		ibid, clause 20, p.221
1 asper per modio	"	-	-	"	"	barley, legumes		ibid
3 aspers each	"	-	-	"	"	horses		ibid
2 aspers each	"	-	-	"	"	cattle, asses		ibid

10 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	slaves		ibid
2%	"	-	-	import	"	all goods		ibid, clause 21, p.222
2%	"	-	-	export	"	"		ibid
50 <u>aspers</u> per <u>vegete</u>	"	-	tax farmer	-	"	wine	settlement at this rate per <u>garatello</u>	ibid, clause 22, p.222



CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA IN 1387								
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
as customarily paid (comercium)	Ottoman empire	-	-	-	Genoese	all goods	as customarily paid according to the form of the old conventions	1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segretto, Materie Politiche 2729, no.26
? per each modio of Romania	"	-	-	export	Genoese, Greeks, Venetians, Arabs (or Muslims), others who pay at a lesser rate	grain, barley, millet, other pulses		ibid

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA IN 1403									
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE	
according to custom	Ottoman Europe	sea, land	-	import	Franks, Venetians, Genoese, Rhodians, Greeks	all goods		1403 = Dennis, 1403, clause 10, p.79	
1 <u>hyperpyra</u> per <u>mozo</u> of Constantinople ( <u>comerchio</u> )	"	-	<u>comerchieri</u>	export	Latins, Greeks	grain		ibid, clause 13, p.79	
? 1 <u>hyperpyron</u> per <u>mozo</u> pf Constantinople ( <u>comerchio</u> )	Negroponte		-	"	?Latins, ?Greeks	grain	anyone taking grain out without paying <u>comerchio</u> was to be punished	ibid, clause 22, p.80	

none (comercium)	Mentege	sea	-	import	Venetians	all goods	if Venetians arrived with goods, but did not want to sell, they could go elsewhere by sea without paying <u>comercium</u>	1403.vii.24 = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and</u> <u>Crusade</u> , doc.1403M, doc1403M DVL, clause 13, pp.228-229
2%	"	land	-	"	"	all goods	if Venetians off- loaded but did not want to sell, they could go elsewhere by land within Mentege	ibid, clause 14, p.229
none (comercium)	"	sea	-	-	"	victuals	if Venetian ships wanted victuals "cum suis denariis", they could take them without paying <u>comercium</u>	ibid, clause 19, p.220
2 aspers per modio	"	-	-	export	"	grain		ibid, clause 20, p.230

1 aspers per modio	"	-	-	"	"	barley, legumes	ibid
3 aspers each	"	-	-	"	"	horses	ibid
2 aspers each	"	-	-	"	"	cattle, asses	ibid
10 aspers each	"	-	-	"	"	slaves	ibid
2%	"	-	-	import	"	all goods	ibid, clause, 21, pp. 230-231
50 aspers per vesete/buta	"	-	tax farmer	-	"	wine	ibid, clause 22, p. 231
						same rate for mezana and caratello	

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN TURCHIA IN 1407 AND 1414

TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
none ( <u>dacia</u> )	Menteşe	sea	-	-	Venetians	water. victuals	Venetian ships could take water and victuals "cum sua pecunia" without paying <u>dacia</u>	1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, <u>Trade and Crusade</u> , doc.1407M, clause 22, p.231
none ( <u>comercium</u> )	"	"	-	-	"	all goods	if Venetians arrived with goods but did not want to sell. they could leave by sea without paying <u>comercium</u>	ibid, clause 13, p.236
2%	"	land	-	-	"	"	if Venetians off-loaded but did not sell and wanted to go elsewhere by land in Menteşe, they could do so without paying <u>comercium</u>	ibid, clause 14, p.236
2 <u>aspers</u> per <u>modio</u>	"	-	-	export	"	grain		ibid, clause 20, p.236
1 <u>asper</u> per <u>modio</u>	"	-	-	"	"	barley, legumes		ibid
3 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	horses		ibid
2 <u>aspers</u> each	"	-	-	"	"	cattle, asses		ibid

10 aspers each	"	-	-	"	"	slaves		ibid
2%	"	-	-	import	"	all goods		ibid
2%	"	-	-	export	"	all goods		ibid
50 aspers per buta	"	-	tax farmer	-	"	wine		ibid
as before (comerchium)	"	-	-	import	"	all goods	to pay comerchium as had been paid in the past	1414.x.17 = Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade, doc.1414M, clause 3, p.238

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN THE LATE 1430S					
DATE	TAX	PLACE	GOODS	SOURCE	
1436.xii.18	2% ("chomarchio de Símiso de intrada")	Samsun	cloth, soap, grapes, sconbril, fostagná	Badoer, Libro, c.152 p.306, c.44, p.89	
1437.ii.17	2% ("chomarchio a 2 per c")	Gelibolu	crape	ibid, c.175 p.352, c.125 p.253	
1437.iv.30	2% ("chomarchio a 2 per c")	Edirne	crape	ibid, c.57 p.114, c.43 p.87	
1437.viii.5	2% ("chomarchio de Garipoli a 2 per c")	Gelibolu	crape	ibid, c.175 p.352, c.125 p.253	
1438.viii.5	2% ("chomarchio a 2 per c")	Gelibolu	wax	ibid, c.191 p.384, c.175 p.353	
1438.viii.18	2% ("chomarchio d'Adrenopoli a 2 per c")	Edirne	muslin	ibid, c.230 p.462, c.89 p.181	
1438.ix.18	2% ("chomarchio de Garipoli a 2 per c")	Gelibolu	wool	ibid, c.247 p.496, c.175 p.353	
1439.iii.12	2% ("chomarchio ha 2 per c")	Edirne	damascine	ibid, c.319 p.640, c.244 p.491	

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE POST 1453

TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
4%	Istanbul Galata	sea	<u>Amiller</u>	import	-	all goods	off-loaded from ships coming from Frankish lands and Genoa, whether sold or not	post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and Inalcik, Kanunname, no.36, p.49; Beldiceanu, Actes, I, no.37, clause 2, p.116
4%	"	"	"	"	-	"	transferred from one ship coming from Frankish lands and Genoa to another, whether sold or not	ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	Muslims tributaries	cloth		Anhegger and Inalcik, ibid, p.49; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 2, pp.116- 117
4%	"	"	"	"	"	grain: flour, wheat, oats, barley, millet		ibid
4%	"	land	"	"	"	cloth: Frankish cloth, brocade of Caffa, cloth, gauze veils, white linen, clothes of linen		Anhegger and Inalcik, ibid, pp.49-50; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 2, pp.117-118



4%	"	"	"	"	"	"	Fur: sable, lynx, marten, Russian fox, chantharide; leather of Russia, leather bottles		ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	"	"	sulphur, mercury		ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	"	"	chains for chaining galley slaves, iron shovels, iron axes, bow handles (?), fish bone (?)		ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	"	"	caviar, fish backs		ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	"	"	mastic		ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	"	"	Vlaque baggage horses		ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	"	"	collars, little bells, glass		ibid
-	"	"	"	"	"	Muslims tributaries ?	all goods	if not sold and taken away by land	Anhegger and inalclik, ibid, p.50; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 2, p.118
4%	"	sea	"	"	"	Muslims tributaries	"	if not sold and taken away by sea	ibid

4%	"	"	?	"	"	Muslims tributaries Frankish tributaries	cloth	arriving within the borders of Gelibolu and unloading on this side or the otherside	ibid
4%	"	"	?	"	"	Muslims tributaries	Frankish cloth, raw silk thread, broadcloth and other cloth	brought from Mudanya	ibid
4%	"	"	-	"	"	Muslims merchants deported or exiled to Istanbul	-		ibid
1 akce per medre	"	"	sea	"	"		all wine except <u>malmsey</u>	whether off-loaded or not, either to drink or sell	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 3, p.118
67 akces per cask + 12 akces liman yesni according to custom	"	"	"	"	"			<u>malmsey</u> wine	ibid

according to custom	"	-	"	-						malmsey, other wine, local wine	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 3, p.118
none	"	sea							all goods	ships in transit	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 4, p.118
Not more than 5%	"	"	"	import	Franks and other tributary infidels					bought by Franksih and other non-tributary infidels	ibid

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN THE REIGN OF MEHMED II								
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
4% (according to custom)	Gelibolu	sea	Anallier	import export	Muslims, tributaries	all goods		Anhegger and inalcik, Kanunname, no.45, p.63; Beldiceanu, Actes, I, no.46, clause 9, p.135
not more than 5% (according to custom)	"	"	"	"	non-tributaries	"		ibid
unspecified	Boleyir, Akliman, outside Kavak	"	"	import	-	"		Anhegger and inalcik, ibid, p.64; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 13, p.136
unspecified	Kozlidere	-	"	-	-	"		ibid
according to custom	between Eceovasi and Tekfurdag	sea	"	import	-	"		ibid

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE 1454-63 OR 1479-81

TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
3% (according to custom)	Bursa	-	<u>Yasakci</u>	import	Muslims, tributaries, infidel merchants from Venice, Genoa, Chios and other places	cloth	brought into Bursa and sold there	Anhegger and Inalcik, <u>Kanunname</u> , no.30, pp.40-41; Beldiceanu, <u>Actes</u> , I, clause, 2, no.31, pp.104
3%	"	-	"	export	"	"	if, after selling their cloth in Bursa, they buy cloth there	Anhegger and Inalcik, <u>ibid.</u> , p.41; Beldiceanu, <u>ibid.</u> , clause 3, pp.104-105
3% (according to custom)	"	-	"	"	infidels	"	if they buy cloth in Bursa for export	<u>ibid</u>
none	"	-	"	import	"	"	if they sell in Bursa all their imported cloth	<u>ibid</u>
3% ?	"	-	"	-	Frankish infidels, tributary or not	"	always to be charged (ie no concession for them as for the above infidels)	<u>ibid</u>

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE JANUARY 1476

TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
4% (according to the custom of Edirne)	Istanbul	sea, land	<u>Amiller</u>	import	sellers	grain: wheat, barley, oats, millet	to be bought into the city through 1 of 3 gates and to be taken to the balance were customs was to be paid	Anhegger and inalcik, Knanunname, no.33, pp.44- 45; Beldiceanu, Actes, I, clause 2, p.109
2%	"	"	"	"	Muslims	flour		ibid
3%	"	-	"	-	infidels	flour		ibid
	"	-	-	-	city's bakers, others	cereals, flour	customs to be taken from city bakers and others who buy flour, wheat, oats, barley, millet to sell	Anhegger and inalcik, ibid, p.45; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 3, p.109

unspecified	Bolagadiman, outside Kavak	sea	<u>Amiller</u>	import	-	all goods	on ships off- loading	Anhegger and inalcik, ibid, p.46; Beldiceanu, ibid, no.34, clause 3, p.110
according to custom	from Eceovasi to Tekirdağ	"	"	-	-	"	on ships off- loading anywhere between Eceovasi and Tekirdağ, customs to be taken after goods had been sold	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 3, p.111
1 akca per medre of Gelibolu	Gelibolu	-	-	-	sellors and producers of must	must		Anhegger and inalcik, ibid, p.45; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 2, p.110

4% (according to the custom of Edirne)	Istanbul	land	<u>Amiller</u>	import	sellers	cereals: wheat, oats, barley, millet	to be brought into the city through 1 of 3 gates only and to be taken straight to the balance were customs was to be taken	c.1476.4.14 =Anhegger and Inalcik, ibid, no.34, p.47; Beldiceanu, ibid, no.35, clause 2, pp.111-112
2%	"	"	"	"	Muslim sellers	flour		ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 2, p.112
3%	"	"	"	-	infidel sellers	flour		ibid
according to custom	"	sea	<u>Amiller</u>	import	-	agricultural products	to be paid at the balance ( <u>kapan</u> )	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 4, p.112



in accordance with the Sultan's order	"	-	"	-	city's bakers and others	flour, oats, wheat, millet	customs to be taken from city bakers and others who buy flour, wheat, oats and millet in order to sell	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 3, p.112
---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------	----------------------------	---	--

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN 1476									
TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE	
5%	ports from Istanbul to the borders of Aydın	sea	'Amiller	import	non tributary Franks, other tributaries	all goods	goods off-loading from ships arriving from Venice, Genoa and other places whether sold or not	post 1476.i.28 =Anhegger and inalcik. Kanunname. no. Beldiceanu. Actes. I, no. clause 2, p.113	
4%	"	"	"	"	Muslims, tributaries	"	"	ibid	
5%	"	"	"	-	non tributaries	"	transferred from one ship to another	ibid: Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 3, p.114	
4%	"	"	"	-	Muslims, tributaries	"	"	ibid	
5%	"	land or sea	"	import	non tributaries	cloth		ibid: Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 4, p.114	
4%	"	"	"	"	Muslims, tributaries	"		ibid	
5%	"	"	"	"	non tributaries	grain:corn, wheat, barley, millet, flour		ibid	

4%	"	"	"	"	"	Muslims, tributaries	"		ibid	
5%	"	"	"	"	"	non tributaries	unspecified goods		ibid	
4%	"	"	"	"	"	Muslims, tributaries			ibid	
4%	"	"	"	"	"	"	foodstuffs apart from corn, wheat, barley, millet, flour		ibid	
5%	"	"	"	"	"	non tributaries	"		ibid	
none	Istanbul	-	-	-	-	-	yoghurt, poultry, eggs, bread, sheep, lambs, similar merchandise		ibid	

unspecified	ports from Istanbul to the borders of Aydin	land	Amiller	import	-	cloth: Frankish cloth, broadcloth of Caffa, cloth of Bursa, raw silk		Anhegger and Inalcik, ibid, p.48; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 5, p.114
"	"	"	"	"	-	Vlaque horses		Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 6, p.114
"	"	"	"	"	-	goods in general		ibid
4%	"	land or sea	"	"	-	goods other than foodstuffs	customs to be paid whether they arrive by land or sea	ibid
5%	"	"	"	"	non tributaries	spices: cane sugar, whole peppers, ginger	in the past customs was not collected on these spices but was to be from now on	Anhegger and Inalcik, ibid, p.48; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 6, pp.114-115
4%	"	"	"	"	Muslims, tributaries	"	"	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 7, p.115

customs in full	"	-	"	export	those who bought goods and exported them	goods bought and exported	to pay customs in full	ibid
none	"	-	-	-	-	-	from those who bought goods but did not export them	ibid; Baldiceanu, ibid, clause 8, p.115
customs on the whole cargo	Mudanya Istanbul Gelibolu	sea	'smaller	import	ships from the Mediterranean or Black Sea	all goods	if they anchored	ibid; Baldiceanu, ibid, clause 9, p.115
none	"	"	"	-	?"	-	if ships put in because of necessity for a few days and dropped anchor but neither loaded nor off-loaded	ibid
full customs	"	"	"	-	?"	-	if they anchored of their own free will and for more than a few days	ibid
none	Mudanya Gelibolu	"	-	-	-	-	if ship declared its merchandise and paid customs at Istanbul and then anchored at Gelibolu or Mudanya, then no further customs was to be charged	ibid

customs	"	"	-	-	-	-	if, having paid in Istanbul, the ship anchored in Gelibolu or Mudanya and off-loaded or loaded goods, it was to pay customs on what was off-loaded	ibid
unspecified	"	"	'Amiller	import	ships from Frankish lands	-	all ships arriving from Frankish lands and anchoring, were to pay customs whetebr they sold goods or not	Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 9, p.115
"	Istanbul Gelibolu Mudanya	"	-	-	-	-	if ship paid customs in one port and went to another, it was not to pay customs again	Anhegger and Inalcik, p.48
1 akce per medra	ports from Istanbul to the borders of Aydin	"	'Amiller	import	-	wine, except malmsey	unloaded or not, to drink or to sell	Anhegger and Inalcik, ibid, p.49; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 10, p.115
67 akces per cask + 12 liman resmi (according to custom)	"	"	"	"	-	malmsey wine		ibid

according to custom	"	-	-	-		malasey wine, other wine, local wine	customs to be taken according to custom	ibid
------------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	------

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN 1476

TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
5%	ports between Istanbul and the borders of Aydin	sea	amiller	import	non tributary Franks, other infidels	all goods	off-loaded from ships arriving from Venice, Genoa and other places, whether sold or not	1476.1.28/11.6 = Anhegger and inalcik, Kanunname, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, Actes, I, clause 2, p.146
4%	"	"	"	"	Muslims, tributaries	"	"	ibid
5%	"	"	"	-	non tributaries, infidels	"	transferred from one ship to another	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 3, p.146
4%	"	"	"	-	Muslims, tributaries	"	"	ibid
according to custom	"	"	"	import	-	Frankish cloth		ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 4, pp.146
"	"	"	"	"	-	grain: wheat, barley, oats, millet, flour		ibid



4%	"	land or sea	"	"	"	-	cloth: Frankish cloth, brocade of Caffa, cloth of Bursa	whether sold or not	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid. clause 5, p.147
4%	"	"	"	"	"	-	Vlaque baggage horses	"	ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	"	-	other goods	"	ibid
according to custom	"	-	"	export	-	-	all goods	on goods bought and exported	ibid
none	"	-	-	-	-	-	"	on goods bought but not exported	ibid
according to custom	"	sea	'Amiller	-	ships from the Mediterranean and Black Sea	"	"	ships from Mediterranean and Black Sea which anchored	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid. clause 6, p.147
none	"	"	-	-	"	-	-	if ships from Mediterranean and Black Sea past without dropping anchor	ibid
1 akce per medre	"	"	'Amiller	import	-	-	wine, except Malmsey	to be drunk or for sale, customs paid after off- loading	Anhegger and inalclk, ibid. pp.74-75; Beldiceanu, ibid. clause 8, p.147

67 akçe per cask + 12 liman resmi (according to custom	"	"	"	"	"	-	Malmsey wine		ibid
according to custom	"	"	"	"	"	-	wine	from every 5 fuc1 of Malmsey other wine or local wine	ibid
1 akçe per medre	"	"	"	"	"	import	sellers and producers of must		Anhegger and inalçık, ibid, p.75; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 11, p.148
?	Bolayır, Akliman, outside Kavak	sea	"	"	"	-	ships which called at Bolayır, Akliman or outside Kavak		ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 12, p.148

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN 1481

TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
4%	?	sea	-	import	-	all goods	ships arriving from Genoa and Venice, and off-loading, whether goods are sold not not	1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and inalclk, Kanunname, no.55, pp.78-79; Beldiceanu, Actes, I, no.56, clause 1, p.151
%	"	"	"	"	Muslims	"	goods transferred from one ship to another	Anhegger and inalclk, ibid, p.79; ibid
2%	"	"	"	"	tributaries	"	"	ibid
4%	"	"	"	"	non Muslims, non tributaries	"	"	ibid
4%	"	land	"	"	Franks	cloth	imported and sold by Frankish merchants	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 6, pp.151-152
none	"	"	"	-	"	cloth ?	if Frankish merchants did not sell and took cloth (?) away by land	ibid
4% (according to custom)	"	sea	"	import	Frankish merchants	cloth	if Frankish merchants did not sell and took the cloth (?) away by sea	ibid

none	"	land	"	"	"	raiyyas, tributaries	"	whether sold or not	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 3, p.151
none	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	if they bought and left with goods by land	ibid
1%	"	sea	"	"	"	Muslims	"	if they bought and left with goods by sea	ibid
2%	"	"	"	"	"	raiyyas, tributaries	"	"	ibid
1%	past Gelibolu	"	"	-	"	Muslims	all goods	if ships past Gelibolu and touched the left or right shore	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 4, p.151
2%	"	"	"	"	"	tributaries	"	"	ibid
"	"	"	"	-	"	Franks	"	"	ibid
1%	?	-	"	import	"	Muslims	cloth: Frankish cloth, broad cloths from Mudanya; raw silk		ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 5, p.151
2%	"	-	"	"	"	tributaries	"		ibid
4%	"	-	"	"	"	Franks	"		ibid

1 akce per medre	"	sea	"	"	"	-	wine, except Malmsey	whether to be drunk or for sale, customs to be collected after off- loading	ibid: Baldiceanu, ibid. clause 6, pp.151-152
67 akces per cask (according to custom)	"	"	"	"	"	-	Malmsey wine		ibid
according to custom	"	-	"	-	-	-	indigenous wine	to be collected according to custom	ibid

CUSTOMS CHARGES IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN 1482

TAX	PLACE	ROUTE	AGENT	IMPORT EXPORT	FROM WHOM	GOODS	DETAILS	SOURCE
4%	Samsun Sinop	sea	'amiller	import	-	cloth, raw silk thread	off-loaded from ships arriving from Veenice, Rum and other infidel vilayets, whether sold or not	1482.i.20 = Anhegger and Inalcik, Kanunname, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, <u>Actes</u> , I, clause 2, p.152
4%	"	"	"	-	-	general merchandise	"	ibid
4%	"	"	"	-	-	-	goods transferred from one ship to another	ibid
1%	"	"	"	-	Muslims	-	"	ibid
2%	"	-	-	-	tributaries	-	"	ibid
4%	"	land	'amiller	import	Frankish merchants	cloth	goods imported and sold by Frankish merchants	ibid; Beldiceanu, <u>ibid</u> , clause 3, p.152
none	"	"	"	"	Frankish merchants ?	cloth ?	if cloth ? was not sold and taken away by land	ibid; Beldiceanu, <u>ibid</u> , clause 3, pp.152-153
4% (according to custom)	"	sea	"	"	"	cloth ?	if cloth? was not sold and taken away by sea	ibid; Beldiceanu, <u>ibid</u> , clause 3, p.153

none	"	land	-	"	raiyyas, tributaries	cloth	imported by raiyyas and tributaries, whether sold or not	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 4, pp.153
none	"	"	-	"	"	cloth	if the goods were taken by land	ibid
2%	"	sea	<u>Amiller</u>	"	tributaries	cloth ?	if the goods exported by sea	ibid
1%	"	"	"	"	Muslims	cloth	"	ibid
1 <u>akce</u> per <u>madre</u>	"	"	"	"	-	wine, except Malmsey	to be drunk or for sale, customs to be collected after off-loading	ibid; Beldiceanu, ibid, clause 5, p.153
67 <u>akces</u> per cask (according to custom)	"	"	"	"	-	Malmsey wine		ibid

### CHAPTER III

#### COMMODITIES

Turchia between the early beginnings of the Ottoman state and the capture of Constantinople in 1453 was an area of intense commerce, one facet of which was the trading activity of the western merchants among whom the Genoese and Venetians held a dominant position. The exchange of goods consisted broadly of the export of raw materials from Turchia and the import into the area of luxury items, although Turchia did produce and export quality products of its own, such as worked cloth. At the same time, Turchia acted as a transit market for eastern luxuries such as silks and spices.

The Genoese were extremely active in the trade in Turchia, not merely coming into the coastal ports from which the goods were exported, such as Theologos and Balat (Palatia), but placing their own agents in such commercial centres as Bursa, Edirne, Gelibolu and Samsun<sup>1</sup>. The Turks too, although appearing by name much less often in the sources, were also active. At the end of the fourteenth century the İsfendiyyar ruler, Süleyman Paşa was trading copper with the Genoese<sup>2</sup>. In the same period a Turkish trader sold alum to a Genoese official in Chios<sup>3</sup>. At the

---

<sup>1</sup> For example Piero Palavexin in Bursa and Polo Morson in Samsun, 1439.vii.8 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.325, p.652; 1437.xii.18 = *ibid*, c.44, p.89.

<sup>2</sup> 1390.i.11 = ASG, Notai cartulare 476, Donato de Clavaro, doc.26. See appendix, document 3.

<sup>3</sup> 1394.ii.18 = ASG, Notaio Donato Clavaro, Sc.39, filze 1, doc.97/240. See appendix document 4.



beginning of the next century, Hacı Mustafa traded copper in Chios<sup>1</sup> and Katib Paşa sold cotton to Genoese merchants there<sup>2</sup>. In the 1430s Ahmed of Licomedia (?Nicomedia, Izmit) bartered grapes for cloth<sup>3</sup>, Ramadan of Samsun, Ali Basa (Paşa), Chazi Rastan (Kadı), Choza Ise (Koca Isa) and Mustafa all sold wax<sup>4</sup>. In the same period a Turk called Saliyet, Ismail and an un-named Turk traded in crepe ("veli crespi") and Chazi Musi turcho (Kadı Musa) in muslin ("veli")<sup>5</sup>. As well as selling, Turks also bought commodities from westerners. In 1436 Jael, factor for Choza Muxalach (Hoca Mu'ala'?), bought a large quantity of Florentine cloth,

---

<sup>1</sup> 1404.xii.31 = ASG, Notaio Gregorio Panissario, Sc.37, filze 1, doc.48. See appendix document 9.

<sup>2</sup> 1414.iv.2 = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1, doc.286. See appendix document 13.

<sup>3</sup> 1436.i.14 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.42, p.84, c.13, p.27; 1436.i.14 = *ibid*, c.43, p.86, c.42, p.85. There is a further entry concerning one *hyperpyron* to be paid to Ahmet, presumably in connection with the same transaction. 1436.i.19 = c.42, p.84, c.16, p.33.

<sup>4</sup> 1437.vi.6 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.71, p.144, c.36, p.73, (Ramadan of Samsun); 1438.iv.31 = *ibid*, c.190, p.382, c.194, p.391, (Ali Basa). In another entry concerning Ali Paşa and the sale of wax he appears on one page as Ali Basia and on the other as Choza (Koca) Ali, 1438.iv.31 = c.194, p.390, c.186, p.375; 1438.xi.4 = *ibid*, c.200, p.02, c.c.200, p.240, c.231, p.465, (Chazi Rastan); 1438.iv.26 = *ibid*, c.190, p.382, c.186, p.375, (Choza Ise). The name is spelt Ise in the first entry and Isse in the second; 1438.iv.26 = *ibid*, c.190, p.382, c.186, p.375 (Mustafa). The name is written with an accent, Mustafà, as is the name Ali. This presumably was a guide to how they were pronounced, with the stress falling on the final syllable, as it does in modern Turkish.

<sup>5</sup> 1436.ix.10 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.7, p.14, c.8, p.17; 1436.x.10 = *ibid*, c.22, p.45; 1437.iii.24 = *ibid*, c.48, p.96, c.52, p.105, (Saliyet); 1437.viii.20 = *ibid*, c.88, p.178, c.68 [bis], p.139, (Ismail); 1436.vii.8 = *ibid*, c.48, p.96, c.68 [bis], p.139, (Unnamed Turk); 1436.viii.20 = *ibid*, c.29, p.58, c.68 [bis], p.139, (Chazi Musi turcho).

paying the very considerable sum of 1,625 *hyperpyra* 23 *karati*<sup>1</sup>. He purchased the cloth by bartering spices and incense<sup>2</sup>. The following year an unnamed Turk bought glassware ("bochaleti")<sup>3</sup>. Apart from trading, Turks earned money from western merchants in other ways. In 1437 a Turk called Jacsia (?Yahya) acted as a porter ("charatier") for hides bought in Edirne<sup>4</sup>.

Turchia was not merely a market to which western merchants come to sell their goods and ship their purchases home, but was also a market in which western merchants bought western imports which they then traded elsewhere in the region as was done, for example, in 1437 when goods bought in Samsun were taken to Trabzon and sold there<sup>5</sup>.

Various commodities dominated the trade between the Turks and the western merchants. Of the exported commodities, the most significant were grain, slaves and alum while the most traded import was cloth. Other commodities, notably metals and wine, too played an importance part in the trade, as did other items which have left less traces in the extant sources.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1436.x.25 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.27, p.54, c.12, p.25.

<sup>2</sup> 1436.x.10 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.26, p.52, c.27, p.55; 1436.xi.10 = *ibid*, c.13, p.26, c.26, p.53.

<sup>3</sup> 1437.x.4 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.88, p.178 ("per veri case 4"), c.68, p.137: "per casa per el trato de una casa ne la qual iera bochaleti 500, venduda a un turcho perp.28".

<sup>4</sup> 1437.iv.30 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.56, p.112, c.36, p.73: "per agozo de pele 300, che pexò chant.14, a asp. 5 per chanter".

<sup>5</sup> 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.152, p.306, c.152, p.307.

## SECTION I: SLAVES

The slave trade was of major importance in the eastern Mediterranean in this period, with the main markets in the coastal towns of Anatolia, in Pera, on Crete, Chios, Cyprus, Rhodes and Naxos. Naxos in particular was an important slave market where Turks sold those they had captured in their raids which extended all over the Aegean<sup>1</sup>. The trade was not restricted to Anatolia and the islands but spread across the Mediterranean to Egypt and further to western Europe as far as Catalonia, with slaves from the markets of the eastern Mediterranean appearing in cities such as Genoa and Venice. Of the Latin merchants involved in this trade, the Genoese were extremely active<sup>2</sup>, channelling slaves from the Black Sea through to the Mamluk Sultanate and largely dominating the slave trade in the eastern Mediterranean. The Venetians were also heavily involved, as were various other Latins such as merchants from other Italian cities, the Hospitallers, Catalans, Barcelonians, Anconitans, merchants from Marseille and other parts of France. The Turks too traded in slaves and Turchia had flourishing slave markets. However the activities of the Turkish merchants could not be compared with that of the two main protagonists: Genoa and Venice.

Turchia appears to have had slaves markets active from the beginning of the fourteenth century onwards. Various

---

<sup>1</sup> Verlinden, 'Recrutement', p.88.

<sup>2</sup> Several of the merchants trading in slaves in Constantinople in the 1430s were Genoese: Bernardo Bonavita, Baoder, *Libro*, c.178, p.358, Polo Doxia, *ibid*, c.49, p.99, c.135, p.272, Lodovigo Guazego, *ibid*, c.135, p.272, Paris Ganbon, *ibid*, c.288, p.578.

Venetian notarial deeds give enactments of slave sales conducted in Crete in the first part of the century in which the vendor had originally bought the slave in Turchia<sup>1</sup>. Menteşe and Aydın had flourishing markets. Ibn Battuta, who was travelling in Anatolia in the early 1330s, bought a young Christian girl in Theologos for 40 *dinars*<sup>2</sup>. Kydones refers to the slave markets of Ephesos<sup>3</sup>. Sultanhisar (Nyssa), inland from Balat (Palatia), had a slave market, or at least slaves were sold there for in 1303 a Greek female from Kadı Kalesi (Ania), close to both Theologos and Sultanhisar (Nyssa), was bought there from the Turks<sup>4</sup>. Slaves were also exported from

---

<sup>1</sup> 1301.x.7 : Verlinden, 'Recrutement', p.86, Rugerius de Rugerio, who in August 1301 sold a slave bought from the Turks, sold in October of the same year a female Greek slave whom his son had bought from the Turks in Turchia; 1301.v.15 = Benvenuto de Brixano, no.119, p.46, Hemanuel Vergici, active in April and May 1301 selling slaves bought from the Turks, sold a slave in May of that year whom he had bought with him from Turchia. 1301.vi.6 = Benvenuto de Brixano, no.172, p.65; 1303.vii.16 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.609, a Greek slave whom the son of the seller had bought in Turkey sold in Candia; 1304.xii.12 : Verlinden, 'Recrutement', p.87, Francesco Catalano sold a female Greek slave he had bought when he was in Turchia; 1304.vi.4 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.611, sale of six Greek slaves whom the seller had bought from the Turks in Turchia; 1304.x.12 in *ibid*, p.612; 1304.x.7 in *ibid*, p.612, sale of seven slaves bought from the Turks in Turchia; 1312.ix.25 : ASV Not. Martino Doto in Verlinden, 'Recrutement', p.89, manumission of a Greek slave from Rhodes, originally bought in Turchia. In 1330 a Greek, bought in Turchia, was freed in Crete, 1330.vi.28 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.626. In 1331 three women and their three children, originally from Negroponte, were sold in Candia. They had been send from Turchia by the agent of the seller, 1331.iii.26 in *ibid*, p.626.

<sup>2</sup> ibn Battuta, p.309.

<sup>3</sup> Kydones, *Pro subsidio Latinorum*, p.981.

<sup>4</sup> 1305.v.27 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.613.

Foça to Sicily<sup>1</sup>. Under the Ottomans too Balat (Palatia) was an exporting port for slaves<sup>2</sup>. There were also markets at Antalya and slaves were exported from there and from Alanya (Candelor). In 1313 a female slave who had been bought at Antalya by an inhabitant of Rhodes, was manumitted in Rhodes<sup>3</sup>. Meğri (Makri, Fetiye) too apparently was a slave market at an early date for in 1300 two inhabitants of Candia contracted to take cloth to Meğri to sell it there and then with the money from the cloth to buy three females whom they were to send back to Crete<sup>4</sup>. Slaves were also sold in Saruhan and Karası<sup>5</sup> in great numbers for according to al-'Umarī the constant inflow of prisoners of war ensured that slaves in the principality of Karası (Marmara) was very numerous, attracting merchants who arrived daily and lived off this traffic in slaves<sup>6</sup>. Kydones refers to the slave markets of Magnesia<sup>7</sup>. Markets also existed in Bursa and on the southern shores of the Black Sea. Slaves were taken from

---

<sup>1</sup> 1439.iii.5 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.304, p.610, c.248, p.499: "per ser Tomà Spinola dal bancho, i qual me fexe scriver Piero Chapelo per segurtà fata a Zuan Mozenigo da Modon e Aluvixe Falier, zoè a ser Tomà Spinola per so nome, su teste chargade per i diti su la nave patron Zuan Bonifatio, di poi che l'averà fato vela de le Foie finchè la serà zonta in Zezilia, a 9 per c. fo de perp. 200".

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.60.

<sup>3</sup> 1313.v.25 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.622.

<sup>4</sup> 1300.iii.2 = Pietro Pizolo, I, no.140, pp.70-71.

<sup>5</sup> Kydones, *Pro subsidio Latinorum*, p.982; Kourouses, p.236.

<sup>6</sup> al-'Umarī, p.367.

<sup>7</sup> Kydones, *Pro subsidio Latinorum*, p.981.

the Crimea to Sinop and Samsun (Simisso) and to Bursa<sup>1</sup>. As the Ottoman Empire grew so did the locations of Turkish controlled slave markets. Gelibolu (Gallipoli) was an important market to which Christian slaves were brought from the European part of the Ottoman empire and from where they were exported<sup>2</sup>. In the 1430s slaves were sold in Üsküp and Edirne and in the area of Belgrade<sup>3</sup>.

Many of the slaves sold in the markets of Turchia and on the Aegean islands during the fourteenth century were Greek Christians. Of these many were enslaved after being captured by the Turks, and traded not only by them but also by fellow Christians. In 1351 the expedition of Paganino Doria resulted in the capture of Marmara Ereğlisi (Heraclea) and the enslavement of 766 Greeks who were subsequently sold on the slave market of Pera<sup>4</sup>. Ibn Battuta described Umur Aydınoğlu as constantly fighting the infidel and making incursions in the area of Constantinople with his warships and taking slaves<sup>5</sup>. The slave markets of Karası were kept well supplied with a constant stream of prisoners taken in war<sup>6</sup>. The numbers taken by the Turks were considerable,

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, ref.100, p.828, refering to the period 1410-11.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, pp.14-15,62.

<sup>3</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), pp.113.114.115; (Istanbul), pp.125,126,127; Piloti, p.14-15.

<sup>4</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, I, pp.303-304. Towards the end of the century it became less acceptable to enslave Orthodox Christians and was forbidden, *ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> ibn Battuta, p.311.

<sup>6</sup> al-'Umarī, p.367.

Sanudo for example recorded how Turks captured 25,000 people during 1331-2<sup>1</sup>, and Turkish raiding was a major problem for the Latins. In the 1331 treaty between Menteşe and Marino Morosini, the Duca di Candia, Orhan agreed to release all those taken from Crete and who were then in his hands or those of his subjects<sup>2</sup>. In a later treaty between the Duca di Candia and Menteşe there is another clause dealing with the problem of slaves from Crete in the lands of Menteşe. This time the emir Musa agreed to hand over to the Duca's ambassador Pietro Badoer slaves from among the 24 slaves who had been abducted from Setia (in eastern Crete) by Turks of Menteşe<sup>3</sup>. In a later period, Ambrogio Bernichono di Arenzano opened a court case over a slave of his whom the Ottomans had captured while fighting in the gulf of Büyük Çekmece (the Gulf of Atira) just south of Istanbul between Küçük Çekmece (Rhegion) and Silivri (Selembria)<sup>4</sup>. Life for those who had escaped from Turkish captivity was not always apparently easy and some at least received hand-outs. Money was given, "per amor de Dio", in Constantinople in 1439 to a "poveromo" who

---

<sup>1</sup> Sanudo (Kuntsmann), No. 5 p. 797

<sup>2</sup> 1331.iv.13, treaty between Duca di Candia Marino Morosini and Orhan, emir of Menteşe = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, p.187 clause 2. It is not clear from the document whether it was a Turkish ship which raided Crete and then took the prisoners as slaves back to Menteşe and to Orhan.

<sup>3</sup> 1358.x.13, treaty between the Duca di Candia Pietro Badoer and Musa, emir of Menteşe = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1358/1359M, pp.217-218 clause 4.

<sup>4</sup> 1403.xi.23 = ASG, San Giorgio, sala 34 590/1307, f.21v. See also 1403.xii.7 = *ibid*, f.23r.

had been rescued from the hands of the Turks<sup>1</sup>. Major battles could lead to a large crop of captives. In this respect the Ottomans did well out of the battle of Nicopolis (1396). An unnamed Turk was able to send the Mamluk Sultan, Barquq, a present of 200 Christians from among the captives he had taken<sup>2</sup>. Enslavement through capture was not just a one-way process, for the Latins too captured Turks and other Muslims whom they then sold into captivity. Jean II de Lusignan in the early fifteenth century seized in successive raids 1,500 subjects of the Mamluk Sultan to boost his labour force in the sugar plantations on Cyprus<sup>3</sup>. In the same period a corsair, Pierre de Laranda, seized a Mamluk ship at Antalya (Setalia) which he sold together with the 150 Saracens on board to the Duc of Naxos, Jacopo de Crispo<sup>4</sup>. One of the accusations levelled against the former Podestà of Pera, Lodisio Banoso, in 1402 was that he had accepted money from Leondario Grecho, factor of the Byzantine Emperor, for certain Turks, captured by Leondario outside the walls of Pera "in the place where the Jews are buried"<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1439.iii.22 = Baoder, *Libro*, c.327, p.656, c.258, p.519.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, pp.109-10. Piloti met some of them. All were happy, beautiful and doing well! ("tous estoient josnes, beaulx et tous eslus").

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, pp.78-79.

<sup>4</sup> Piloti, pp.95-96.

<sup>5</sup> 1402.v.30 = ASG, San Giorgio, sala 34 n.590/1306, f.72v: "quod Lodixius olim potestas acceperat ab ipso Leondario certos perperos contra deum et iusticiam et hoc fuit occasione certorum turchorum captorum per ipsum Leondarium".



Greek slaves were common in the courts of the various beyliks at the beginning of the century. Mehmed, the emir of Aydın, had Greek pages in his palace at Birgi in the 1330s. Among the parting gifts he gave to the traveller ibn Battuta was a Greek slave called Mīhail. Mehmed's son, Umur, also presented ibn Battuta with a slave when ibn Battuta visited him at Izmir. The slave was a young Christian called Nicola<sup>1</sup>.

The Turks were active traders, selling Greek slaves to Latin merchants who had no scruples over buying and selling Orthodox Christians. There are various extant slave sales recorded in Candia in the early 1300s in which Greek slaves bought from the Turks were sold in Crete<sup>2</sup>. Later, as the Ottomans advanced so the importance of captives from the Balkans in the slave markets increased. In the early 1380s

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibn Battuta, p.309.

<sup>2</sup> 1304.xi.9 in Verlinden, 'Recrutement', pp.86-87 (a Greek female bought from the Turks); 1305.v.27 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.613 (sale of Maria de Romania de loco qui dicitur Ania, quam emi in Nasso de turchis); 1305.vi.2 in *ibid*, p.613 (Greek bought from Turks); 1305.vii.1 in *ibid*, p.614 (Costa of Chios, bought from the Turks, sold in Candia); 1305.xi.20 in *ibid*, p.615 and Verlinden, 'Recrutement', p.88 (Eudoxia of Samos, bought originally from the Turks, bought by an inhabitant of Coron in Crete); 1306.iii.2 in *ibid*, p.88 and Verlinden, 'Crète', p.615 (Female Greek, Erini, de loco Theologo, bought from the Turks). Other slaves, probably Greek judging by their names, were sold by the Turks: 1301.iv.8 = Benvenuto de Brixano, no.1, p.5 (Georgius); 1301.v.1 = *ibid*, no.68, p.29 (Maria); 1301.vii.9 = *ibid*, no.222, p.82 (Herinim); 1301.viii.1 = *ibid*, no.256, p.95 (Maria). One merchant, Hemanuel Vergici, seems to have been particularly active, selling in April 1301 five slaves whom he had bought from the Turks and one in May, 1301.iv.8 = *ibid*, no.4, p.6 (Anna); 1301.iv.9 = *ibid*, no.10, p.8 (Maria bought from the Turks); 1301.iv.9 = *ibid*, no.11, p.8 (from the Turks); 1301.iv.19 = *ibid*, no.46, p.21 (Herinim from the Turks). 1301.v.15 = *ibid*, no.120, pp.46-47 (Cally from the Turks).

many Bulgars were bought from the Ottomans by Latin merchants and subsequently sold in Candia<sup>1</sup>. Export taxes on slaves were imposed by both Menteşe and Aydın in treaties with the Duca di Candia<sup>2</sup>. From the 1353 treaty it is clear that the Turks of Aydın were trading in slaves with the Genoese as well as with the Venetians and one may presume that the Turks of Menteşe did likewise.

The Ottomans too were involved in the slave trade including the trade of slaves to Egypt. Muslim slave merchants were active at the court of the Ottoman ruler, in Edirne and Gelibolu (Gallipoli), where they bought young slaves, sometimes as many as 100 or 200, whom they transported to Cairo where they were sold to the Mamluk Sultan. These slaves were shipped from Gelibolu (Gallipoli) on Muslim vessels, or sometimes on those of Christians "malvais et mal disposés". As relations between the Ottomans and the Genoese were generally good these erring Christians may well have been Genoese<sup>3</sup>. It is possible that the Ottomans pursued a more active trade policy than that followed by the emirs of Menteşe and Aydın. One of Bayezid's demands in his peace proposal presented to the Hospitallers in 1393 was that he should be able to sell slaves in Rhodes

---

<sup>1</sup> ASV, Notario Manoli Bresciano in Verlinden, 'Recrutement', p.165.

<sup>2</sup> 1331.iv.13 = treaty between Orhan, emir of Menteşe, and Marino Morosini, Duca di Candia, Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187; 1353.iv.7 = treaty between Hızır and Marino Morosini, Zachariadou, *ibid*, doc.1353A, clause 19, p.214.

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, pp.14-15. Piloti describes the merchants as "payens" which I take to mean here Muslim.

without any restrictions<sup>1</sup>. This implies that the Ottomans, in contrast to the Turks of Menteşe and Aydın, sold slaves to Latins not merely in their own markets in Turchia, but actively went out to the markets on the Aegean islands to sell. As the Muslim merchants buying slaves in the markets in Turchia for the Mamluk Sultanate travelled with their merchandise to Cairo<sup>2</sup>, and as some of these merchants may well have been Ottomans, it is possible that this too indicates a more adventurous trade policy than that of the beyliks.

Apart from selling, the Turks were apparently buyers of slaves, although presumably they were not as active in this field as they were as slave sellers since their territorial expansion ensured them of a constant source of slaves as booty. A Genoese document of 1413, enacted in Chios, makes it clear that the Genoese traded in slaves with the Ottomans in Turchia. Simon de Serra appointed Giovanni di Babaino as procurator to retrieve two of his slaves who had fled from Chios to Turchia. If Giovanni was unable to recover these slaves, he was to get the price for them which those holding the slaves, subjects of the lords of Turchia, were accustomed to pay for slaves acquired thus or transported there by the Genoese<sup>3</sup>. Genoese transporting of slaves into Turchia is

---

<sup>1</sup> Luttrell, 'Hospitallers', pp.96-97, citing a document from the Malta archives.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.15.

<sup>3</sup> 1413.vii.5 = ASG , Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46 filze 1 doc.17. "precium et preciam quod et que detentores eorum in locis Turchie et subditi dominis Turchie soliti sunt solvere illis ad quorum vertutem sclavi ad partes illas fugiunt seu

also attested in the Massaria of Caffa for 1410 to 1411 which give various references to slaves being taken from the Crimea to Sinop, Samsun (Simisso) and Bursa where presumably they were bought by the Ottomans. In the same period 1,080 slaves were taken from Caffa to the southern shores of the Black Sea<sup>1</sup>. In a Genoese document of 1431 Batista Macio acknowledged having taken 20 men from Lo Vati near Sevastopolis to Liminia in Turchia<sup>2</sup>. Batista had contravened a decree, issued in Caffa a year earlier, forbidding the taking of men from there to Turchia and was petitioning for this to be excused on the grounds that he did not know of the decree at the time of his transgression<sup>3</sup>.

Turks were themselves also commodities. They were bought and sold often by Genoese merchants, particularly in the slave markets of Chios and Genoa<sup>4</sup> as well as in Candia<sup>5</sup> and

---

converti sunt con Januensibus "

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.828, note 100.

<sup>2</sup> Panaretos mentions the emirs of Limnia, Panaretos, *Chronicon Trapezuntinum*, p.369, 89. They were probably the Tacüddinoğulları, who were active in the area of Terme (Themiskyra) and Çarşamba, just east of Samsun, Pitcher, *Historical Geography*, p.31.

<sup>3</sup> c.1431 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 39, busta 88, doc.440.

<sup>4</sup> eg. 1360.x.20 = ASG, Notai Ignoti XVIII.10, Raffaele di Casanova, doc. on fourth page, *recto*, enactment of the sale of a 15 year old male Turkish slave, called Nicola, for 47 florins, enacted in Chios; 1404.v.15 = ASG, Notaio Gregorio Panissario, Sc.37 filze 1, doc.82, Jane Crossecheri [? Crossorheri, or Crossoiheri] de Folia Vetera, sold to Nicolao de Mareo, a 25 year old male Turkish slave called Mithare for 21 gold ducats, enacted in Chios; 1423.v. = ASG, Notaio Giovanni Labaino, Sc.40 filze 1, doc.383, 1423.v.c.9 = *ibid*, doc.381, 1423.v.11 = *ibid*, doc.382, <1423>.v.14 = *ibid*, doc. - (no number). Other sales were enacted in Genoa, eg. 1370.ii.14 = ASG, Notaio Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39 filze 1, doc.374, sale of female Turkish slave of c.25 years, for

Famagusta<sup>1</sup>. 2.4% of the slaves known to have been sold in the Genoese slave market between 1300 and 1408 were Turks<sup>2</sup>. Turks were being sold very early in the fourteenth century in Constantinople<sup>3</sup> and Crete<sup>4</sup>. The presence of Turkish slaves in Crete at this period is further attested by the order of the Duca di Candia, Jacopo Barozzi, in 1301 that anyone helping Turkish, Greek or Saracen slaves to escape from the island would be fined 50 *hyperpyra* per slave<sup>5</sup>.

---

45 Genoese pounds.

<sup>5</sup> 1303.v.10 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.609, a Genoese merchant, Nicolao de Sauro, sold his male Turkish slave in Candia; 1300.v.30 = Pietro Pizolo, I, no.539, pp.246-247, sale of three Turkish slaves "nomine unus Ysilami quem vis clamare Vaxili et alius Feramardo quem vis clamare Georgium et alius Isa quem vis clamare Michali".

<sup>1</sup> 1301.111.1 = Lamberto di Sambuceto, no.255, pp.302-303; 1301.iii.1 = *ibid*, no.256, pp.303-304; 1301.iii.8 = *ibid*, no.270, pp.321-323; 1301.iii.28 = *ibid*, no.293, pp.351-353; 1301.v.22 = *ibid*, no.380, pp.456-457; 1301.iv.1 = *ibid*, no.331, pp.396-397; 1301.iv.11 = *ibid*, no.340, pp.404-405; 1301.vii.27 = Lamberto di Sambuceto (Pavoni), no.20, pp.26-27 refers to a slave from Cassaria (?Kayseri); 1301.vii.27 = *ibid*, no.21, pp.27-28; 1301.ix.2 = *ibid*, no.78, pp.105-106; 1301.ix.28 = *ibid*, no.168, pp.206-207; 1302.iii.14 = *ibid*, no.122, pp.151-152; 1302.viii.8 = *ibid*, no.281, pp.336-339.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.800.

<sup>3</sup> 1305.vi.8 and 1305.vi.10 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.613, two Turks who had been sold in Constantinople were sold again in Crete.

<sup>4</sup> 1301.vi.10 = Benvenuto de Brixano, no.174, pp.65-66, the sale of a Turkish slave called Mamut, who was sold to Magister Marco, the plague doctor (*Medico plagarum*); 1301.viii.5 = *ibid*, no.263, p.97, the sale of a female Turk called Berta. There is reference to a Turkish slave in Crete in 1271, Verlinden, 'Crète', p.594. 1303.vii.20, 1303.ix.12, 1303.xii.17, 1304.v.11, 1304.ix.5 (though Verlinden suggests that from the name this slave, although described as Turkish, was in fact Greek) in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.609; 1305.vi.8, 1305.vi.10 in *ibid*, p.613. There is also a manumission of a Turkish slave in Candia, 1312.x.23 in *ibid*, p.619.

<sup>5</sup> Verlinden, 'Crète', p.605.

Turks continued to be sold as slaves in the markets of Crete throughout the fourteenth century<sup>1</sup>. Turkish slaves also appear in Venice in the fifteenth century<sup>2</sup>. In 1400 nine Turkish heads were listed among goods received from the ship of Giovanni Obizio of Venice, whose ship sailed from Venice to Ibiza. The Turks were forwarded to Valencia for sale, with a letter describing one of the slaves as a woman who could "sew and do everything...Your money will be well placed in her"<sup>3</sup>. Turkish slaves appear too in Pera<sup>4</sup>.

The numbers of Turkish slaves on the Aegean islands were sometimes considered a matter of security risk. The Hospitallers on Rhodes controlled the movements of their Turkish slaves within the town<sup>5</sup>. In 1357 a decree was issued in Rhodes forbidding Turkish slaves from being kept within the fortified town or sent with the Brethren's horses to collect grass or hay. One Turkish slave was however

---

<sup>1</sup> 1329.vi.29 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.626, sale of a Turk bought in Caffa; 1331.x.1 in *ibid*, p.627; 1332.iii.24 in *ibid*, p.627; 1381.xi.9 in *ibid*, p.635, sale of three Turks from Alto Loco; 1382.iv.30 in *ibid*, p.638; 1382.v.23 in *ibid*, p.640.

<sup>2</sup> Verlinden, 'Recrutement', pp.84,171. Verlinden, pp.171-172, gives examples of Turkish slave sales in Venice in 1410, 1418, 1428, 1434, 1444 and 1456.

<sup>3</sup> 1400.ix.1 = Origo, *Merchant of Prato*, p.99 and note 41, citing Archivio Datini, file 1142, Valute di merci e cariche di navi.

<sup>4</sup> 1403.xii.1 = ASG, San' Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.44r, a court case over Turkish slaves. 1403.xii.3 = *ibid*, ff.58v-59r, a case concerning a Turkish slave who had fled from Pera.

<sup>5</sup> Luttrell, 'Hospitallers', p.87.

permitted to each hostel<sup>1</sup>. In Crete there were a series of instructions from the Senate concerning Turkish slaves on the island. Before 1313 there was a ban imposed on importing slaves except Turks and Tatars. This was perhaps a defensive measure occasioned by fear of a Greek revolt and directed against Greek slaves<sup>2</sup>. Later however fear of the Turks resulted in various controls. In 1341 the Venetian authorities ordered that only those Turks captured in attacks could be brought into Crete and that these captives had to be taken out of the island after six months. Various penalties were imposed on those bringing in any Turks who had not been captured and on anyone buying such a Turk<sup>3</sup>. Towards the end of the century the Senate gave instructions that all captured Turks were to be sent to Crete where they were to work only for the Comune. If any official used these Turks for his own purposes he was to be fined five *hyperpyra* per slave<sup>4</sup>. In 1363 the Venetian Senate doubled the penalty for contravention of the law on Turks being sold as slaves in Crete, as the numbers of Turkish slaves were considered too great<sup>5</sup>. Even when in pressing need of slaves, the Cretan authorities, while encouraging the importation of slaves into

---

<sup>1</sup> Luttrell, 'Slavery at Rhodes', pp.86-87.

<sup>2</sup> This ban was revoked in 1313. 1313.x.1 = Ratti Vidulich, *Duca di Candia Bandi*, no.1, p.5.

<sup>3</sup> 1341.iii.6 = Theotokes, II/I, no.25, pp.205-6. See also 1357.vi.26 = *ibid*, II/2, no.5, pp.51-52.

<sup>4</sup> 1393.iii.11 = Noiret, *Documents*, p.55.

<sup>5</sup> 1363.vi.8 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 410, pp.106-107; 1363.vi.8 = Theotokes, II/2, no.12, p.110.

the island, prohibited the import of Turks<sup>1</sup>. A few years later however the Venetian Senate ordered the authorities in Euboea to send 25 Turks to work in Candia<sup>2</sup>. In the early fifteenth century shortage of labour was also a problem on Cyprus<sup>3</sup>.

That the number of Turkish slaves was also high in Pera seems possibly indicated by a court case of 1403 over the imprisonment of a female Saracen who was in prison together with many other Turkish slaves<sup>4</sup>.

Clearly the slave trade was a profitable enterprise both for the Turks and for the Latin merchants. It is however extremely difficult to establish a clear picture of slave prices in Turchia and the other markets of the Eastern mediterranean. Various factors affected the price of slaves in general, such as age, looks and health. The condition of the slave at purchase was very important and accusations of imperfections could lead to court action. In 1423 a case was tried in Genoa over the sale of a female slave, described as a Bulgar from Turchia. The case arose because the slave had

---

<sup>1</sup> 1393.iii.11 = Noiret, *Documents*, pp.54-55.

<sup>2</sup> 1405.xii.15 = Noiret, *Documents*, p.163.

<sup>3</sup> Jean II de Lusignan, in reply to the ambassadors of the Mamluk Sultan who were endeavouring to arrange for the ransom of a large number of the Sultan's subjects, seized in successive raiding by the King, said that he needed those he had seized to work the land: "le roy respondist que lez .M. et .v.C. Sarrasins qu'il avoit prins estoit pou au grant besoing que l'isole de Chipre en avoit: car elle avoit grant besoing de laboreus qui laborassent lez terres pour faire sucre", Piloti, p.79.

<sup>4</sup>1403.xi.13 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.57v. But see Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, I, p.306.



suffered from "falling sickness" ("morbus caducus"), presumably epilepsy, since she had received a blow on the head when captured. She had been in Turchia, sold in Chios and transported from there by ship to Genoa. The case was an attempt to have the sale declared invalid because of the contention that the slave had already been ill at the time of purchase<sup>1</sup>. Among the various specific factors influencing the price rate in Anatolia in this period were political developments in the area which affected not only the local markets but those further away. Prices in Genoa, for example, rose at the beginning of the fourteenth century to between 15 and 16 *libri* as a result of the Venetian - Genoese war of Curzola (1294 - 1299) which cut easy communications between Italy and the markets of the eastern Mediterranean. The later war between Genoa and Venice as well as troubles in Caffa with the Tatars of Solgat caused a price increase between 1375 and 1385 to 62 *libri* for female slaves and 54 for male. Some years later Ottoman success and that of Timur again interrupted the trade and caused another price rise. Another factor which affected the price of Turkish slaves in Genoa was that Turkish and Saracen slaves were apparently less valued on the Genoese market, particularly at the beginning of the fourteenth century, than Bulgars, Russians, Circassians and Tatars<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1423.v. = ASG, Notaio Giovanni Labaino, Sc.40 filze 1, doc.383, 1423.v.c.9 = *ibid*, doc.381, 1423.v.11 = *ibid*, doc.382, <1423>.v.14 = *ibid*, doc. - (no number).

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.811. Slave prices also varied in the Mamluk sultanate according to the origin of the slave. Tatars were the most expensive (130-140 *ducats*),

One of the factors accounting for fluctuating prices through the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries was the quantity of slaves on the market. At the end of the thirteenth century the price of a Turkish slave fell below that of a sheep as a result of the military successes of the Byzantine general Philanthropenos<sup>1</sup>. In 842/1438-9, conquests, this time those of the Ottomans, again caused the price of slaves to fall so that beautiful young females sold, in lots of three, for only 100 *akçes* (c.9.5 *hyperpyra*)<sup>2</sup>. The Ottoman success of 841/1437-8 in Hungary resulted in so much booty that a four year old boy was sold at Üsküp for 20 *akçes* (c.1.9 *hyperpyra*)<sup>3</sup>. In the same year Aşıkpaşazade himself captured five slaves whom he sold in Üsküp for 900 *akçes* (c.85.7 *hyperpyra*)<sup>4</sup>. Aşıkpaşazade sold captives from the campaigns of 842/1438-9 in Edirne for 100 *akçes* for two, and 100 *akçes* for three slaves (c.9.5 *hyperpyra*). The Belgrade market seems to have been less affected by the numbers of captives for Aşıkpaşazade sold a 17 year old boy there for 100 *akçes* (c.9.5 *hyperpyra*), while female slaves fetched 150 *akçes* (c.14.3 *hyperpyra*)<sup>5</sup>. These

---

followed by Circassians (110-120 *ducats*), Greeks (90 *ducats*), Albanians, Dalmatians and Serbs (70-80 *ducats*), Piloti, p.15.

<sup>1</sup> Planoudes, *Epistulae*, letter 78, p.99.

<sup>2</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.117; (Istanbul), p.128. The Istanbul edition says slaves girls sold for this figure, while the Giese edition specifies that they sold in threes for 100 *akçes*.

<sup>3</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.114; (Istanbul), p.126.

<sup>4</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.115; (Istanbul), p.127.

<sup>5</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.113; (Istanbul), p.125.

figures, particularly that of 100 akçes for three females, are extremely low. Even if one does not accept their accuracy at face value but allows for some ex<sup>3</sup>aggeration, they still show to just what an extent a glut on the market could push prices down.

Slaves were clearly an important source of income in Turchia. Both Menteşe and Aydın imposed export duties on slaves. Slaves exported from Menteşe were taxed in 1331 at the rate of ten aspers per slave<sup>1</sup>, the same rate applying in 1407<sup>2</sup>, while those from Aydın too were taxed under the 1353 treaty between the Emir Hızır and the Duca di Candia although no specific rate is given, the treaty only specifying that the Venetians were to pay on slaves at the same rates as the Rhodians and the Genoese<sup>3</sup>. It has been argued on the basis of the treaties between Menteşe, Aydın and Venice that slaves were sold in Menteşe for an average of 24 *hyperpyra* (12 ducats)<sup>4</sup>, as this was the fine imposed on anyone abducting a slave and payable to the slave's master, while that in Aydın was perhaps around 30 *hyperpyra* (15 ducats), the amount

---

<sup>1</sup> 1331.iv.13 = treaty between Orhan and Marino Morosini, Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331 M, clause 3, p.187.

<sup>2</sup> 1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1407M, clause 20, p.236.

<sup>3</sup> 1353.iv.7 = treaty between Hızır and Marino Morosini, Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1353 A, clause 19, p.214.

<sup>4</sup> I give throughout the section the actual figure as it appears in the original source and convert it, where necessary, into *hyperpyra* and ducats for ease of comparison. During most the fourteenth century the ratio of ducat to *hyperperon* was approximately 1:2, and for the end of the century and the beginning of the next was 1:3.

of the fine imposed in the 1348 treaty with Hızır<sup>1</sup>. However, a young Greek female was sold at Theologos in the early 1330s for 40 gold *dinars* (92 *hyperpyra*, 46 *ducats*)<sup>2</sup>. Presumably she was particularly attractive, but even so the discrepancy between the proposed average for Aydın in 1348 and ibn Battuta's purchase price is considerable. The same discrepancy appears for slaves sold in Menteşe. Two Greeks were sold in Balat (Palatia) in 1355 for 92 *hyperpyra* (46 *ducats*), again in sharp contrast to the suggested average price based on the fines imposed in the treaty<sup>3</sup>. Fines in general do not seem a reliable guide for slave prices particularly in view of the fine of 50 *hyperpyra* per slave imposed by the Duca di Candia, Jacopo Barozzi in 1301 on anyone helping Turkish, Greek or Saracen slaves to escape from the island<sup>4</sup>. In comparison the average price for slaves on the Cretan market in the early fourteenth century was 8 *hyperpyra* (4 *ducats*) for males and 17 *hyperpyra* (8.5 *ducats*) for females<sup>5</sup>. Clearly the fine here bears very little relation to the average sale price.

One might be able to suggest some sort of price guide by

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.162; 1337.pre iv. = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 18, pp.197-198; 1348.viii.18 = *ibid*, doc.1348A, clause 23, p.210; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 18, p.221; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, 1403M and 1403M DVL, clause 18, p.230; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 18, p.236.

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Battuta, p.309.

<sup>3</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.163, note 680.

<sup>4</sup> Verlinden, 'Crète', p.605.

<sup>5</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.161.

looking at what was paid for slaves, originally bought from the Turks and subsequently sold in Crete.

PRICES OF TURKISH SLAVES SOLD IN CRETE, 1301			
DATE	DESCRIPTION	PRICE	SOURCE
1301.vi.10	1 male	27 <u>hyperpyra</u> 2 <u>grossi</u>	Benvenuto de Brixano, no.174, pp.65-66
1301.viii.5	1 female	22 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.263, p.97

  

PRICES OF SLAVES BOUGHT ORIGINALLY FROM TURKS AND SOLD IN CRETE, 1301 AND 1304			
DATE	DESCRIPTION	PRICE	SOURCE
1301.iv.8	1 male	14 <u>hyperpyra</u>	Benvenuto de Brixano, no.1, p.5
1301.iv.8	1 female	18 <u>hyperpyra</u> , 1 <u>grosso</u>	ibid, no.4, p.6
1301.iv.9	1 female	25 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.10, p.8
1301.iv.9	1 female	28 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.11, p.8
1301.iv.9	1 female	27 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.46, p.21
1301.iv.27	1 female	20 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.63, p.27
1301.v.1	1 female	14 gold <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.68, p.29
1301.v.15	1 female	18 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.119, p.46
1301.v.15	1 female	18 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.120, pp.46-47
1301.vi.6	1 female	6 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.172, p.65
1301.vii.9	1 female	15 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.222, p.82
1301.viii.1	1 female	17 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, no.256, p.95
1304.x.7	1 female, Greek	9 <u>hyperpyra</u>	Verlinden, 'Recrutment', p.86
1304.xi.8	1 female, Greek	15 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, p.86
1304.xii.12	1 female, Greek	11 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, p.87.

The Latin merchants who had bought the slaves from the Turks

expected to make a profit by selling them in Crete. The prices therefore should reflect both the cost of transporting the slaves and the profit margin set by the merchants. Thus slaves must have been sold on average at less than 16 *hyperpyra* (eight *ducats*) per slave, this being roughly the average price of slaves originally bought in Turchia and sold in Crete. The average price of a male slave on the Cretan market in the early fourteenth century was eight *hyperpyra* (4 *ducats*) and that for a female was 17 *hyperpyra* (8.5 *ducats*)<sup>1</sup>. Therefore at the beginning of the century, judging by the prices charged for the slaves bought from the Turks and then sold in Crete, and from the average price of slaves in Crete, slaves must have been sold in Turchia for something less than 16 *hyperpyra* (8 *ducats*), perhaps nearer the 12.5 *hyperpyra* (6.25 *ducats*) average from the combined male and female figures in Crete. Perhaps the higher than average price charged for the slaves bought from the Turks reflects the costs the merchants incurred in bringing them to the market in Crete.

By the 1330s slave prices in Turchia had presumably risen, for the increased strength of the beyliks would presumably have been reflected in their ability to insist on higher prices for the goods they sold. At the same time Menteşe imposed an export tax on slaves taken from its territories under its treaty with Venetian Crete. Orhan imposed a tax of ten *aspers* (0.88 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.44 of a *ducat*) per slave taken out of the beylik while that for

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.161.

horses was three *aspers* (0.26 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.13 of a *ducat*) per animal and for cattle two *aspers* (0.16 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.08 of a *ducat*)<sup>1</sup>. If, as it would seem reasonable to assume, a similar tax was imposed by the emir of *Menteşe* on other western merchants, this tax would presumably be reflected in the prices of slaves bought in *Turchia* and sold elsewhere by western merchants. Therefore one may assume that by the 1330s the prices paid for slaves in *Turchia* was higher than the proposed average of 12.5 *hyperpyra* (6.25 *ducats*) for the beginning of the century.

That there was a rise in prices seems supported by the rise in slave prices in *Crete* where, in the 1330s, the average price for women was between 31 and 55 *hyperpyra* (15.5 and 27.5 *ducats*) and for men between 25 and 36 *hyperpyra* (12.5 and 18 *ducats*)<sup>2</sup>. Thus the prices in *Crete* had increased in the 30 years from the beginning of the century by approximately 100-300% for female slaves and by 300-450% for men. Such a price rise in *Crete* over such a short period is striking. It is in part explained by the increase in demand for slaves on the island and by the greater organization of the *Cretan* market<sup>3</sup>, but this does not seem perhaps sufficient. It may also be partly explained by the

---

<sup>1</sup> 1331.iv.13 = *Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187. One should however note that the same rate was levied in the 1407 treaty between *Crete* and *Menteşe*, 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 20, p.236, thus possibly undermining the significance of the rate as a guide to slave prices.

<sup>2</sup> *Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade*, p.161.

<sup>3</sup> *Zacharidaou, Trade and Crusade*, p.161.

political development in Turchia at that time. The Turkish beyliks were becoming more powerful political units, more stable and more able to hold their own in the international market, while at the same time Turchia continued to be an important slave market, constantly replenished with slaves brought in from the incessant Turkish raids and conquests. Perhaps the high price in Crete for slaves in the 1330s is a reflection of this increased Turkish muscle.

If one takes the percentage rise in slave prices in Crete as a guide and multiplies a postulated average price in Turchia in the early part of the century of 12.5 *hyperpyra* (6.25 ducats) by an average of 300%, one arrives at an average price for slaves sold in Turchia in the 1330s of 37.5 *hyperpyra* (18.75 ducats).

Prices in Crete do not appear to have risen during the middle years of the century and in the 1360s the average price of a female slave was 35 *hyperpyra* (17.5 ducats)<sup>1</sup>. This is suprising when one considers how concerned the Venetian Senate was to import slaves to work the land, Crete suffering from an acknowledged lack of manpower, and in view of the effect of the Black Death on slave markets in general<sup>2</sup>. While it is true that the Black Death wiped out slave owners as well as slaves, thus reducing the number of potential buyers, the plague must have carried off a higher

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.161.

<sup>2</sup> After the scarcity caused by the Black Death, the Council of the *Rogati* offered rewards for those who found slaves who had fled, Ratti-Vidulich, *Duca di Candia, Quatenus Consiliorum*, pp.129-130.



proportion of the weaker and under-nourished members of the society, including slaves, than of those in a fitter condition and with ability to escape the approaching plague by moving elsewhere. After the outbreak of the Black Death prices in Genoa increased steeply to an average between 1350 and 1360 of 55 *libri* for women, 35 *libri* for men. Perhaps this apparent stability in the slave price on Crete is again connected with political developments in Turchia, or rather within the Ottoman empire for by the 1360s the Empire was expanding rapidly and possibly creating a glut of slaves on the markets in the eastern Mediterranean. After around 1360 the prices did fall in Genoa due to the large number of slaves on the market and settled at between 37 and 40 *libri*.

At the same time however the strength of the new empire should have ensured that it was able to charge more than the less powerful beyliks. Certainly by the 1380s the average price in Crete of female slaves had risen considerably to 96 *hyperpyra* (48 *ducats*)<sup>1</sup>, representing a 275% increase on the average price in the 1360s, with men fetching an average of 64 *hyperpyra* (32 *ducats*). If one uses this 275% increase as a guide for prices of slaves in Turchia in this period, one gets an average price of around 103.12 *hyperpyra* (51.56 *ducats*) which seems high in comparison with Crete.

With these apparently huge percentage increases in prices through the fourteenth century one must bear in mind that they may not have been real increases but rather, in part at least, the result of currency devaluation. The Genoese

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.162.

pound, for example, lost 50% of its value against silver and 33% against gold during the fourteenth century<sup>1</sup>. Similarly the ratio of *ducat* to *hyperpyra* was approximately 1:2 for most of the fourteenth century, but 1:3 for the end of the century and the beginning of the next<sup>2</sup>.

If one turns to the average prices in the slave market on Chios, the above conclusions do not appear to be reinforced, although at the same time there is some corrolation between the two sets of figures. Between 1359 and 1412 the average price, which did not fluctuate greatly nor vary between the sexes, was 60 to 70 *hyperpyra* for the first part of the period, 90 to 105 *hyperpyra* (30 to 35 *ducats*) for the end of the century and the beginning of the next<sup>3</sup>. Chios is in this respect different from the markets in Crete and Genoa and, if one accepts at least some increase in prices in Turchia, from the market there too. It seems odd that, considering the various political upheavals which affected prices in markets in the same area, that prices did not rise too in Chios. Perhaps this is a reflection of the randomness of extant sources rather than a genuine reflection of the position at that time. The Chian slave market also differed from the markets of Genoa and Crete in that there was no apparent distinction made between male and female prices. In Genoa female slaves were always more expensive than male ones<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.814.

<sup>2</sup> Bertelè. *`Iperpero Byzantino`*, p.84.

<sup>3</sup> Balard, *La Romanie Génoise*, I, pp.309-310.

<sup>4</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.812.

This is also true of slaves in Crete<sup>1</sup>.

One can also perhaps use slave prices in Constantinople as a guide for possible prices in Anatolia in the 1430s for it would seem reasonable to assume that the market in Constantinople would not be so divergent from markets in Turchia and its prices thus not extremely different from those charged in Anatolia.

PRICE OF SLAVES IN CONSTANTINOPLE IN THE LATE 1430S			
DATE	DESCRIPTION	PRICE	SOURCE
1436.i.15	1 female Russian (sciava rossa), c.16 years, called Maria, in sound health	114 <u>hyperpyra</u>	Badoer, <u>Libro</u> , c.45 p.90, c.16 p.33
1436.viii.7	8 slaves (teste), female Circassians and ? (zirchase e avogaze), 5 of which were good and beautiful females, c.20-25 years, one other female was c.28 years, the other two were young boys (garzone), c.14 years, of clean and sound condition	91 <u>hyperpyra</u> each	ibid, c.45 p.90, c.50 p.101 (They were sent to Venice)
1436.xi.23	1 male slave (sciavo avogaxo), c.18 years, kept for work in the house, sold in sound condition	95 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.45 p.90, c.141 p.285
1437.i.24	2 slaves (teste) kept for service in the house, one of whom was a female Russian called Maria, c.16 years, and one male ? (un sciavo avogaxo), c.18 years	210 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.172 p.346, c.45 p.91
1437.ii.1	1 female (sciava), c.20 years, Circassian, with some warts on her left hand	108 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.178 p.358, c.169 p.341
1437.iii.24	Tatar slaves (teste tartare), one male, c.15 years, baptized and given the name Terzo, the other female, c.20 years, called Madalena, both in sound health	180 <u>hyperpyra</u> for the two	ibid, c.45 p.90, c.64 p.129. (They were bartered for cloth)

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, pp.161-162.

1437.xi.12	1 female Russian (testa), c.18 years, short stature, called Chatarina	110 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.135 p.272
1437.xi.12	1 female Tatar (testa), c.18 years, tall, called Oraxi in her own language	135 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.135 p.272, c.143 p.289
1437.xi.21	1 Russian male (balaban), c.20 years, castrated? (desgreziado)	100 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.135 p.272, c.143 p.289
1437.xi.21	1 male Tatar (balaban), c.26, of average height	100 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.135 p.272, c.143 p.289
1437.xii.10	1 female Tatar (sciava)	135 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.143 p.288, c.148 p.299
1437.xii.17	1 male (balaban)	100 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.143 p.288, c.49 p.99
1438.iii.17	1 female Tatar, c.22 years	90 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.172 p.346, c.169 p.341
1438.vii.8	5 slaves (balabani): 2 c.20 years, 1 c.25 years, 2 c.30 years	70 <u>hyperpyra</u> each	ibid, c.172 p.346, c.220 p.443
1438.vii.16	7 slaves (balabani) all aged between 20 and 25	80 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.172 p.346, c.222 p.447
1438.vii.26	Slaves (teste e balaban)	107.5 <u>hyperpyra</u> each	ibid, c.220 p.442, c.224 p.451 <sup>1</sup> .
1438.vii.22	1 male Tatar slave (balaban tartaro)	74 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.172 p.346, c.222 p.447. (The slave was sent to Catalonia)

---

<sup>1</sup> The entry concerns a partnership of merchants formed for a voyage to Maiorca. Large numbers of slaves were involved, one merchant trading 150 slaves, worth 16,125 *hyperpyra*, another 19, worth 2,042.5 *hyperpyra*, another 13, worth 1,397.5 *hyperpyra*. At least some of these slaves were Tatars as one of the references is to a "balaban tartaro".

1438.x.2	13 slaves (balabani)	11 = 74 <u>hyperpyra</u> 1 = 50 <u>hyperpyra</u> 1 = 30 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.247 p.496, c.231 p.465
1438.x.3	1 slave (balaban)	74 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.247 p.496, c.231 p.465
1438.x.3	1 slave (balaban)	73 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.247 p.496, c.239 p.465
1438.x.11	del balaban da la quistion	74 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.258 p.518, c.231 p.465
1438.xi.22	1 male Russian slave (sciavo), c.15 years	27 Venetian gold <u>ducats</u> = 88 <u>hyperpyra</u> 14 <u>karati</u>	ibid, c.288 p.578, c.249 p.501
1438.xii.8	1 female Tatar (tartara), 20 years, with a scar on her forehead (la qual à una bota sul fronte)	120 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.293 p.588, c.258 p.519
1438.xii.10	1 tall female Russian (sciava rosa atartarada, grande de persona), c.18-20 years	110 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.293 p.588, c.294 p.591
1439.iii.2	1 female (testa)	110 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.294 p.590, c.319 p.641
1439.iii.9	2 female Russian (rose) slaves (teste), 1 aged 18-20, 1 aged 13-14	190 <u>hyperpyra</u> for the two	ibid, c.172 p.346, c.211 p.425
1439.vi.7	2 females (teste)	204 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.327 p.656, c.172 p.347
1439.vii.18	2 Russian females (femene)	90 <u>hyperpyra</u> each	ibid, c.224 p.450, c.331 p.665
1439.xi.22	1 female (teste)	107 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.373 p.748, c.260 p.523
1439.xi.28	1 male (avogaxo), c.20 years, called Zorzi	95 <u>hyperpyra</u>	ibid, c.357 p.716, c.172 p.347

The average slave price in Constantinople in the 1430s seems to have been in the region of 97 *hyperpyra* for all slaves, female slaves fetching more than males, on average 108 *hyperpyra* to 101 *hyperpyra*. These figures are in line roughly with those for Chios at the end of the fourteenth century of 90-105 *hyperpyra* and with the price on Crete in the same period for female slaves of around 96 *hyperpyra*, though considerably more than the male slave price there of 64 *hyperpyra*. The figure is also near that suggested for Turchia at the end of the century of 103 *hyperpyra*. These figures seem to indicate a certain stability in the slave market, with no great fluctuations in price between the end of the fourteenth century and the 1430s, or, even if there was a sharp price increase or decrease at some time during this period, it was temporary.

The price of Turkish slaves sold both in the markets of the eastern Mediterranean and in Genoa is also difficult to fix with any accuracy. In comparison with slaves, many of them Greek, bought by Latin merchants from Turchia at the beginning of the fourteenth century and sold in Crete on average for 8 *hyperpyra* per female slave and 17 *hyperpyra* for males, Turkish slaves sold in Cyprus cost on average in the same period 29 *hyperpyra*. The two prices from Crete are slightly less than this. Turkish slaves sold in Genoa between 1300 and 1310 cost an average of 33 *hyperpyra*, approximately 12.5% more than the cost on Cyprus. Of the prices for slaves sold in Genoa in this period and listed by Professor Balard, the average price for Turks, both men and

women, was the lowest. Greek males, in comparison, sold on average for 66 *hyperpyra*<sup>1</sup>. The average price over this period in Genoa for female Turkish slaves was 28 *libri* 18 *soldi* and for males 16 *libri* 18 *soldi*.

AVERAGE PRICES FOR TURKISH SLAVES SOLD IN GENOA 1300 - 1408<sup>2</sup>

<u>Year</u>	<u>Average Price for Women</u>	<u>Average Price for Men</u>
1300 - 1310	12 <u>libri</u> 10 <u>soldi</u> (c.18 <u>ducats</u> , 36 <u>hyperpyra</u> )	10 <u>libri</u> 16 <u>soldi</u> (c.16.5 <u>ducats</u> , 33 <u>hyperpyra</u> )
1311 - 1320	13 <u>libri</u> 13 <u>soldi</u> (c.19.5 <u>ducats</u> , 39 <u>hyperpyra</u> )	18 <u>libri</u> (c.27 <u>ducats</u> , 54 <u>hyperpyra</u> )
1321 - 1330	15 <u>libri</u> (c.22.5 <u>ducats</u> , 45 <u>hyperpyra</u> )	17 <u>libri</u> 5 <u>soldi</u> (c.25.5 <u>ducats</u> , 51 <u>hyperpyra</u> )
1341 - 1350	15 <u>libri</u> (c.22.5 <u>ducats</u> , 45 <u>hyperpyra</u> )	15 <u>libri</u> (c.22.5 <u>ducats</u> , 45 <u>hyperpyra</u> )
1351 - 1360	60 <u>libri</u> (c.90 <u>ducats</u> , 180 <u>hyperpyra</u> )	28 <u>libri</u> 10 <u>soldi</u> (c.42 <u>ducats</u> , 84 <u>hyperpyra</u> )
1361 - 1370	45 <u>libri</u> (c.67.5 <u>ducats</u> , 135 <u>hyperpyra</u> )	-
1401 - 1408	90 <u>libri</u> (c.135 <u>ducats</u> , 405 <u>hyperpyra</u> )	

Thus if a Genoese merchant bought a male Greek slave in Chios for 17 *hyperpyra* and sold him in Genoa for 66 *hyperpyra*, his profit would be something less than 400%. The profit margin on Turkish slaves bought in Cyprus and sold in Genoa thus is infinitesimal. Either the available figures do not allow one at all to form a reliable picture of comparative prices or, possibly, Turks sold in Cyprus were for the home market and not for export to Genoa. In any case, from these figures it

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, between pp.812 and 813.

<sup>2</sup> These averages are taken from Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, between pp.812-13.

would seem that Turkish slaves were more valuable in the eastern Mediterranean markets, if not in Genoa, than Greek slaves. This possibly reflects the numbers available with more and more Greeks on the market as the Turkish conquests advanced.

In order to get some comprehension of the real value of slaves it is perhaps useful to compare their prices with those of other commodities on the market. Professor Balard has calculated that in comparison with grain, slaves in Genoa were an expensive commodity<sup>1</sup>. Slaves were certainly of greater value than livestock exported from the beylik of Menteşe as the export tax imposed on them in 1331 was ten *aspers* per slave while that for horses was three *aspers* (0.26 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.13 of a *ducat*) per animal, and for cattle two *aspers* (0.16 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.08 of a *ducat*<sup>2</sup>). However the tax rate may not be an altogether reliable guide as over 70 years later the same rate was again imposed on exported slaves<sup>3</sup>.

Ransoming was another form of income generated from the slave trade and was clearly widespread. It was used not only between Christians and Muslims but also between Christians and fellow Christians. In 1301 Notara Sevasto, the son of Paulus Notaropulus, was sold by Filippo Bicontolo, Nicolao de La Fasina, Marcelino de Ancona and Andrea Çerbino who had

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.815.

<sup>2</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187.

<sup>3</sup> 1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1407M, clause 20, p.236.



captured him rebelling against the Doge and Comune of Venice. 6,050 *hyperpyra* were to be handed over for him when his ransom arrived<sup>1</sup>. The ransom clearly represented a profit as in August of the same year Michaelaele, the son of Giovanni Maselo, sold to Giovanni Bicontolo the whole of his part of the profit which was to accrue from the ransom of Notara Sevasto<sup>2</sup>. In 1301 Phylipachis de Caristo sold two slaves, with the proviso that should they wish to ransom themselves through their relatives, they should be allowed to do so<sup>3</sup>. A similar clause was included in the deed of sale enacted again by Phylipachis in the same month when selling a Greek whom he had captured in Samos. If the slave's father or any of his relations should wish to ransom him, then this was to be agreed to<sup>4</sup>. The same condition was imposed on the sale of a female Greek slave from Samos, sold in Candia in 1300<sup>5</sup>.

Slaves were clearly ransomed back from the Turks by the Genoese and the Venetians. In 1392 there is an entry in the account books of the Comune of Genoa for expenses incurred by Petro de Groto in ransoming one of his slaves of Caffa from

---

<sup>1</sup> 1301.vii.5 = Benvenuto de Brixano: nos.215,216,217, p.79. See also 1301.viii.6 = *ibid.* no.281, pp.103-104; 1301.viii.6 = *ibid.* no.282, p.104; 1301.viii.21 = *ibid.* no.305. In documents 281 and 305 the captured man is called Michaelaele Notara and in 282 Michaelaele Notara Sevasto, most probably the title Σεβαστός.

<sup>2</sup> 1301.viii.6 = Benvenuto de Brixano, no.282, p.104.

<sup>3</sup> 1301.vii.16 = Benvenuto de Brixano, no.236, p.87.

<sup>4</sup> 1301.vii.9 = Benvenuto de Brixano, no.220, p.81.

<sup>5</sup> 1300.iii.7 = Pietro Pizolo, I, no.173, p.85.

the Turks<sup>1</sup>. In 1408 a Greek woman was in Genoa making arrangements about the money she owed for being ransomed from the Turks<sup>2</sup>. There are also various examples of other Latins paying ransom. In 1304 two Greeks of Leros, enslaved by the Turks, agreed to be the slaves of the inhabitant of Candia who had ransomed them<sup>3</sup> and in the same year another Greek acknowledged himself to be the slave of Filippo de Milano who too had ransomed him<sup>4</sup>. In 1369 three Venetians were ransomed from the Turks for 130 ducats<sup>5</sup>. Several years later Nicolao Maximo was ransomed for 150 ducats, a large sum indicating his importance<sup>6</sup>.

It seems that this system of ransoming was also used by the Turks to ransom back from the Christians. In 1403 Giovanni Centuriono made a complaint against Giuliano de Levanto, accusing him of taking from his house without his knowledge or permission his two Turkish slaves, whom he had bought from Guilliello de Turino, and first imprisoning them and then selling one of them and sending the other to Genoa. Giovanni called for Giuliano to be made to pay the ransom of 2,000 aspers for each of these slaves and the 1,000 aspers which he had paid to Leonardo Constantio for a slave of his

---

<sup>1</sup> 1392.iv.19 = ASG, Antico Comune 22, ff.76,194.

<sup>2</sup> 1408.v.19 = ASG, Notario Johannis de Alegro, C.472, f.273r-v.

<sup>3</sup> 1304.v.8 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.611.

<sup>4</sup> 1304.vii.6 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p.612.

<sup>5</sup> 1369.ix.6 : Santschi, *Regestes*, no.170, p.39.

<sup>6</sup> 1394.iv.6 : Santschi, *Regestes*, no.354, p.90.

whom they had sent to Turchia to get the ransom for the slaves<sup>1</sup>. From this it appears that Giovanni was intending to ransom his Turkish slaves and in order to do so had sent another of his slaves, presumably either Turkish or Turkish speaking, to Turchia to organise payment. Possibly Giuliano paid the 1,000 aspers to Leonardo Constantio for the slave's passage.

In the same year Giuliano di Palma made a complaint against the ex Podestà Janoto Lomellino. According to Giuliano, he had had nine Turkish slaves whom he and his partners (*socii*) had captured and whom Giuliano had bought from his partners. Of these, two were in his own house, the other seven having escaped from prison. Giuliano accused Janoto of sending his officials to take the two slaves from his house against his will. Giuliano was therefore claiming the 3,000 Turkish silver aspers he was expecting as ransom from the slaves' relations<sup>2</sup>. From a further document on the case it appears that Giuliano had had nine Turkish slaves in prison but that they had escaped. Giuliano managed to get three back, of whom one had broken his leg falling from the walls of Pera in his attempt to flee and died in Giuliano's house. Giuliano kept the remaining two slaves in his house expecting the ransom of 1,500 aspers each from their relations. These two were removed from Giuliano's house on

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.58r.

<sup>2</sup> 1403.xii.1 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.44r.

orders of the then Podestà and put into prison<sup>1</sup>.

In reply to these charges Janoto Lomellino, claiming that Bartolomeo Rubeo was in fact Podestà at the time, said it was known that Giuliano had committed many acts of piracy against the Turks and had disregarded the orders of the Podestà. Giuliano had, according to Janoto, received under promise the said Turks and their ransom which they gave to him. Not content with this ransom, he had kept the slaves to sell them. Peace had then been arranged with the Turks under which it was agreed that all Turks and especially those who were detained by Giuliano were to be released. Janoto and the Podestà Bartolomeo took the slaves held by Giuliano and handed them over to the ambassadors of the Turks who had come to complete the peace<sup>2</sup>. In evidence Giuliano de Levanto confirmed that the slaves were handed over to a certain Turk who came to ask for them. Giuliano explained that he had not actually seen the hand-over himself but had been told about it by his partner (*socius*) Giovanni de Monte who had freed the slaves on the orders of Janoto<sup>3</sup>.

While it is thus clear that ransoming between the Turks and the Latins, as a two-way process, did take place, the mechanism by which people, wishing to ransom their slaves or relations, were able to find where they were held and by

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403.xii.12 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.45r.

<sup>2</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.44r-v.

<sup>3</sup> 1403.xii.12 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.45v.

whom, to organise a satisfactory payment and to exchange the money for the enslaved person, is very obscure. It seems possible that in the case of Latins ransoming from the Turks, people either going to Turchia or sent there specially were charged with paying the ransom and, possibly, collecting the person ransomed. In 1327 Andreas de Raynaldo, who was about to set out for Turchia, received from a Greek in Crete 55 *hyperpyra* for the ransom of his daughter, a slave in Turchia of a Turkish Paşa called Murad<sup>1</sup>. As for Turks ransoming from the Latins it seems possible that the ambassadors were used as intermediaries. This was certainly the case when the Mamluk Sultan Barsbay dispatched an ambassador to endeavour to ransom 1,500 of his subjects seized by the King of Cyprus, Jean II de Lusignan<sup>2</sup>. The Turkish slaves held in Pera in 1403 were, on the conclusion of peace, handed over to the

---

<sup>1</sup> 1327.viii.16, Verlinden, 'Crète', p.625.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.79. I assume from context that the Sultan was Barsbay since, in retaliation for the failure of the embassy, Barsbay closed the Holy Sepulchre. When the Mamluk Sultan Faraj was trying to ransom 150 of his subjects from the Duc of Naxos, Jacopo Crispo, he attempted at first to force the Venetians to send an ambassador to deal with it. When this failed, successive ambassadors explaining that the Duc of Naxos was not under their control, he seized Venetian goods. Their hand thus forced, the Venetians then sent Piloti who was able to organize a ransom of 3,000 *ducats*, to which, although wanting 10 000, the Duc agreed for the sake of good relations with Venice, "en tant que all fin de .ij. mois fûmes d'acors d'avoir lezdis Sarrasins, avecques aulcune fammes sarrasines qui estoient avecque eulx, pour .iiij.M. sucas; et ainsi li fist le payement. Dénotant à chescune personne que lezdis Sarrasins, avecques .viij. marchans qui estoient entre eulx, lezquelx me cognoissoient, estoit pusiens de poyer .x.M. ducas; mais le siegneur duc, pour estre bien avecques Venitians, consenti tout". The Saracens were seized about 1402 and finally ransomed at the end of 1408 or beginning of 1409. Piloti, pp.95-103.

Turkish ambassadors<sup>1</sup> while the Turkish ambassador, Petro Longo, was to receive from the Podestà Dexerino de Podio payment for a Turkish or Bulgar slave who had fled from Turchia to Chios and was then in the possession of Michael Neamonitus<sup>2</sup>.

Apart from these official channels it appears that people may have acted on their own. Giovanni Centuriono sent a slave to Turchia to organise the ransoming of the Turkish slaves he held<sup>3</sup>. In 1413 Simon de Serra appointed a procurator to get back his two slaves who had fled from Chios to Turchia. The procurator, Giovanni de Babaino, was to track down whoever was holding them, to sell them and to send the money back to Simon<sup>4</sup>. Although this is not a case of ransoming, presumably the same procedure would have been used in locating those missing. The ransom could also be arranged through the slave concerned who then presumably furnished the information necessary to contact his or her relations. In 1403 Giuliano de Palma sued Janoto Lomellino for the 3,000 aspers he had agreed as ransom with his two Turkish slaves

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.44r-v.

<sup>2</sup> 1403.x.3 = ASG, Notaio Gregorio Panissario, Sc.37, filza 1, doc.21.

<sup>3</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.58r.

<sup>4</sup> 1413.vii.5 = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filza 1, doc.17. Giovanni de Babaino was not apparently successful for in 1414.vi.13 = *ibid*, doc.293, Simon appointed another procurator to find his missing slaves.

and their relatives<sup>1</sup>.

It seems also that Turks who had money, or goods, with them could pay their own ransom. In the case against Janoto Lomellino brought by Giuliano di Palma in 1403, Janoto alleged that the Turks whom Giuliano held had paid their own ransom to him but that, finding this ransom insufficient, Giuliano had detained them for sale<sup>2</sup>. This seems to have applied not only to Turks. In 1300 a Greek female slave from Samos was sold in Crete with the proviso that should she wish to ransom herself so that she could return to Samos, the then buyer was to accept this<sup>3</sup>. It may be that the sum required from the slave as a ransom was high for in Majorca at the beginning of the fourteenth century slaves wishing to ransom themselves had to pay very highly indeed<sup>4</sup>.

Ransoming was therefore an alternative way of earning money from slaves as opposed to selling them. Presumably ransoming could be more lucrative on occasion for while there were many slaves on the market, for the relatives concerned there was only one person they wanted back. Therefore the ransom demanded could be much higher than the price of the slave as a commodity. This certainly seems to have been the case with Maghribians captured by Catalans or

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403.xii.1 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.44r.

<sup>2</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.44r-v.

<sup>3</sup> 1300.iii.7 = Pietro Pizolo, I, no.173, p.85.

<sup>4</sup> Dufourcq, 'Prix et niveau', pp.502-503. Among the examples Dufourcq gives is that of a woman bought for 460 sous who had to pay a ransom of 920 sous.

vice-versa at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries<sup>1</sup>. It seems that the Genoese, and presumably other Latins, carried out raids in which they took captives whom they then imprisoned while contacting their relations and organising a satisfactory ransoming. Turkish slaves were certainly present in the prison in Pera at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Guilliello de Turino was accused of imprisoning the slaves of Giuliano de Levanto before selling one and sending the other to Genoa<sup>2</sup>. Giuliano de Palma kept in prison nine Turkish slaves whom he and his partners (*socii*) had captured<sup>3</sup>. Another document of the same period refers to many Turkish slaves in the prison in Pera<sup>4</sup>. If the slaves were not kept there for this purpose it is difficult to think up any other explanation.

Even without imprisonment slaves seem to have had a somewhat miserable existence which presumably accounts for the great prevalence of runaway slaves, a constant theme in the relations between the Turks and the Genoese and Venetians in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Arab traveller ibn Battuta also suffered from the problem of escaping slaves while travelling in Anatolia in the 1330s. When staying at

---

<sup>1</sup> Dufourcq, 'Prix et niveau', pp.501-504. On occasion the ransom was incomparably higher than the slave price by as much, according to Dufourcq, as ten times.

<sup>2</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.58r.

<sup>3</sup> 1403.xii.12 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.45r.

<sup>4</sup> 1430.xi.13 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.57v.



Manisa, in the beylik of Saruhan, one of ibn Battuta's slaves fled in the direction of Phokaea, together with another slave and ibn Battuta's horses. They were however all recaptured and returned to ibn Battuta the following day<sup>1</sup>.

The problem of slaves running away either from Turks to Latins or vice-versa appears at the very beginning of the fourteenth century. In 1301 Jacopo Barozzi, the Duca di Candia, imposed a fine of 50 *hyperpyra* per slave on anyone helping Turkish, Greek or Saracen slaves to escape from Crete<sup>2</sup>. As the average price for slaves on the Cretan market in the same period was 8 *hyperpyra* (4 *ducats*) for males and 17 *hyperpyra* (8.5 *ducats*) for females<sup>3</sup> the scale of the problem for the Cretan authorities is obvious. This problem recurs in Venetian treaties throughout the fourteenth century. A clause of the 1337 treaty between the Duca di Candia and İbrahim, emir of Menteşe, stated that if a slave fled taking goods with him, the goods were to be restored though the slave remained free; and if a master or pilot of a ship knowingly took a slave on board, he was to pay 12 *florins* to the slave's master<sup>4</sup>. This clause is repeated in the 1375 treaty between Ahmed, emir of Menteşe, and the Duca di Candia<sup>5</sup> with similar clauses appearing in the 1403 and

---

<sup>1</sup> ibn Battuta, pp.313-314.

<sup>2</sup> Verlinden, 'Crète', p.605.

<sup>3</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.161.

<sup>4</sup> 1337.pre iv, = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 18, pp.197-198.

<sup>5</sup> 1375.iv.22, = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1375M, clause 18, p.221.

1407 treaties between İlyas, emir of Menteşe and the Duca di Candia<sup>1</sup>. Musa, emir of Menteşe, made a treaty in 1358 with the Duca di Candia in which he promised to hand over to the Duca's ambassador certain slaves whom he had in his lands, to search diligently for the rest of these slaves, still missing, and to hand them back should they be found<sup>2</sup>. A clause dealing with runaway slaves also appears in the 1348 treaty between the Sancta Unio and Hızır of Aydın which specified the payment of 15 *florins* by the party which received a runaway slave to the party from which the slave had fled. Any goods the slave had taken from his master were to be handed back<sup>3</sup>.

The problem of runaway slaves also forms a clause in the 1387 treaty between the Ottoman Sultan Murad and the Genoese Comune. The significance of the problem is apparent from the fact that this is one of the few detailed and most extensive clauses in the treaty. The Genoese agreed that if any slave fled from Murad to Pera, that slave was to be handed over to the Podestà who was to pay the price of the slave to the master plus 100 *hyperpyra*. Murad, for his part, undertook to return all slaves who fled from their Genoese masters into Turchia or Grecia, that is areas which had come under Ottoman

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403.vii.12 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1403M and 1403M DVL, clause 18, p.230; 1407.vi.2, = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 18, p.236.

<sup>2</sup> 1358.x.13, = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1358/1359M clause 4, pp.217-218.

<sup>3</sup> 1348.viii.18, = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1348A clause 23, p.210.

domination<sup>1</sup>, unless the slave was recognized to be a Muslim, in which case Murad was to pay a fair price for the slave concerned<sup>2</sup>. An entry in the deliberations of the Venetian Senate in the same year as the treaty shows that the Venetians were anxious that the issue of runaway slaves from Ottoman lands should not be a cause of friction between Venice and the Sultan, although Venice, while professing innocence, was undoubtedly profiting from the situation. The Venetian envoy was instructed that should Murad complain of Venetian ships accepting his slaves on board and transporting them elsewhere against his wishes, he was to assure Murad that Venetian ships and citizens were forbidden from loading his slaves and that it was in no way the intention of Venice to act in such a manner<sup>3</sup>

The problem continued into the reign of Bayezid and beyond. In 1390 there was a dispute over payment for alum occasioned by the flight of certain slaves from Turchia to Phokaea<sup>4</sup>; and in 1403 the Podestà of Chios, Dexerinus de Podio, agreed to pay 25 *florins* to Petro Longo, "ambassador of the Turks", for a Turkish or Bulgar slave who had recently

---

<sup>1</sup> Under Murad there was a considerable Ottoman expansion into remaining Byzantine territory, Thessalonika falling to them in 1387.

<sup>2</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segreto, Materie Politiche 2729, doc.26; Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 7, p.15.

<sup>3</sup> 1387.x.3, ASV, Senato Misti 40, f.95v = *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca*, no.35.

<sup>4</sup> 1394.ii.18 = ASG, Notario Donato de Clavaro Sc. 39 filza 1, doc. 97/240.

fled from Turchia<sup>1</sup>. In the same year Batista Spinolla, procurator of Ricardo de Vindobonis, sued Giuliano de Levanto over a Turkish slave whom Ricardo had left in Giuliano's care and who had fled<sup>2</sup>. In 1413 Simon de Serra appointed a procurator to retrieve his two slaves who had fled from Chios to Turchia<sup>3</sup>. There is one particularly tragic case of a runaway slave who actually tried to run back to his master. In 1401 Ambrosio Bernichono de Arenzano was obliged by the *Capitanei* Ettore de Flisco and Ottobono Giustiniano to sail with his ship from Pera against the Turks in the gulf of Büyük Çekmece (Gulfus Atire in Grecia), south of Istanbul between Küçük Çekmece (Rhegion) and Silivri (Selebria). While he was there one of his slaves, a 25 year old Tatar called Asperto, was captured by the Turks. After about a year the slave managed to escape from the Turkish commander Şerefedin (Sarafadinus) and reached Pera on board a Gallacian ship. Unfortunately the Gallacians then wished to sell him. Asperto appealed to three friends of Ambrosio who interceded with the Podestà on his behalf pointing out that he could not be sold as he had not been captured by the Gallacians and was in fact the slave of Ambrosio. The Podestà however paid no attention and had Asperto imprisoned. Despite further remonstrances from Ambrosio's friends, the Podestà handed

---

<sup>1</sup> 1403.x.3, ASG, Notario Gregorio Panissario Sc. 37 filze 1, doc. 21.

<sup>2</sup> 1430.xii.3 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, ff.58v-59r.

<sup>3</sup> 1413.vii.5 = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filza 1, doc.17.

Asperto over to the Gallacians to do with him what they wanted. Ambrosio in turn sued the Podestà for the 200 *hyperpyra* at which Asperto was valued<sup>151</sup>. In evidence, Enrico Baldinelo [?Baldinel], appearing for Ambrosio, said that he had gone to a castle which the Turks then called Cotolo on business for the Comune of Pera in connection with the current war between Pera and the Turks. Ambrosio, then in Pera, had asked Enrico to find out if there was there a Tatar slave, captured by the Turks. When Enrico arrived, he had made enquiries and had, in the presence of some Turks, seen a Tatar slave who said he belonged to Ambrosio. He had asked the slave why he did not escape, to which the slave had replied that he would willing do so if possible and return to Pera, search for Ambrosio and stay with him<sup>152</sup>.

The concern over recovering escaped slaves indicates their value in the economy of the late medieval Mediterranean world and highlights their considerable importance as a commodity in the trade between the Turks and the Genoese, a trade dominated by Genoese merchants and one in which the Turks took part both as traders and as trade items.

---

<sup>151</sup> 1403.xi.23 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.21r.

<sup>152</sup> 1403.xii.7 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1307, f.23r.

## SECTION 2: GRAIN

Grain was one of the most important commodities in trade between the eastern Mediterranean and the western city states in the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries, even being regarded by Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini as the cause of the western crusade against Aydin in 1344<sup>1</sup>. It was a trade in which Genoese merchants played a major role. According to Professor Balard, "Pour Gênes, plus peut-être que pour aucune autre ville de l'Occident médiéval le commerce du blé est un commerce de masse"<sup>2</sup>. Genoese dominated the Bulgarian and Black Sea areas supplying grain to Constantinople<sup>3</sup> and were among the western merchants who replaced the Byzantines in trading grain from the ports of Mesembria and Anchialos where the Genoese of Pera became particularly active<sup>4</sup>. Genoa had not only to supply the city itself but also on occasion her colonies. Pera needed a constant supply of grain and suffered at times a dearth, as at the beginning of fifteenth century, a situation which often led to profiteering<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini', pp.50-51.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.750.

<sup>3</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.756.

<sup>4</sup> Laiou, 'Provisioning', p.92.

<sup>5</sup> In the inquiry into their conduct, two ex-officials of Pera, Ettore de Flisto and Ottobono Giustiniano, were accused, among other things, of bringing grain from Chios to trade in Pera, 1402.v.30 = ASG, San Giorgio 34 n.590/1306, f.101v. There were various other accusations concerning Ettore and Ottobono involving grain. Petro Natono complained of being forced by them to carry grain free of charge from Chios to Pera, *ibid* = *ibid* and 1402.v.26 = *ibid*, f.97r. They also were charged with selling grain in Constantinople and of

Before looking at the grain trade between the Genoese and the Turks it is essential to consider exactly what kind of cereals were traded. The most common terms used in Latin sources are *frumentum*, *granum* and *bladum*. These terms appear to mean grain in general and to be at first glance interchangeable<sup>1</sup>. In the two versions of Caroldo one refers to *biave* and the other to *frumenti*<sup>2</sup>. In a report on the situation in Romania made to the Venetian Signoria by a Genoese, Jacopo de Orado, in September 1401, Jacopo reported that there was much "bladorum" in Caffa selling at the rate of "modium frumenti aspros centum"<sup>3</sup>. G T Dennis translates *bladorum* here as *wheat* and *frumentum* as *grain*. However a clause in the 1331 treaty between Venice and Menteşe might perhaps be taken to indicate that the term *bladum* was more general in meaning than *frumentum*, as the first phrase refers to "bladi et leguminum, bobum, equorum et sclavorum" whereas the sentence in the same clause which specifies the tax rates to be paid refers to "frumento...ordeo...legumine...", so distinguishing two types, grain/wheat/corn and barley,

---

profiting, together with the Byzantine Emperor and his factor Leondarius, in selling grain, 1402.v.26 = *ibid*, f.97r; 1402.v.27 = *ibid*, f.97v, 1402.v.30 = *ibid*, f. 101v,f.102r.

<sup>1</sup> Lewis and Short, *Latin Dictionary*, define *frumentum* as corn, grain and *granum* as grain, seed, small kernel; Latham, *Medieval Latin*, defines *bladum* as corn, grain, especially wheat; Evans, Pegolotti, p.414 defines *biado* as grain and *granum* as wheat, p.420. Neirmeyer defines *bladum* as a) bread-corn (wheat, rye, spelt), b) wheat; *frumentum* as wheat; *granum* as a) corn, b) wheat.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysostomides, 'Caroldo', pp.176-177.

<sup>3</sup> 1401.ix.10 = Dennis, 'Three Reports', no.1, clause 7, p.246.

presumably covered in the previous phrase by the word *bladum*<sup>1</sup>. That there could be a difference between *frumentum* and *bladum* seems confirmed by a clause in the 1278 list of complaints by Venetians against Byzantium. Stefano Gondeo went to Constantinople with his ship loaded with "frumento et ordeo" but was prevented from selling or doing anything with "ipso blando". He, in consequence, suffered loss, the greater part of the "frumentum et ordeum" being destroyed. Stefano claimed damages for his ship and for the "frumento et ordeo"<sup>2</sup>. Here it appears as if *bladum* was a more general term than *frumentum* and could mean both grain/corn and barley. In both the 1277 chrysobul of Michael VIII and in the treaty of 1285 between Venice and Byzantium, Venetians were granted freedom to enter the Empire from the Black sea "cum frumento vel blado ...et frumento seu alio blado"<sup>3</sup>. *Frumento* was thus here a type of *blado* while *blado* had a more general meaning. This meaning also appears in a document dating from 1345 in which the Venetian Senate, discussing the Byzantine attempt to impose tax on grain imported from

---

<sup>1</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187: "...duo per centinario, excepto comercio et solutione bladi et leguminum, bobum, equorum et sclavorum. Et non debeant solvere in omnibus terris dicti admirati commercium vel dacia nisi una vice, etiam si ipsi portarent merces suas in pluribus terris. Et de frumento debeant solvere aspros duos pro modio et de ordeo et legumine asprum unum pro modio et de bove aspros duos, de equos aspros tres et de sclavo aspros decem pro quolibet predictorum".

<sup>2</sup> 1278.iii. = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.370, p.240.

<sup>3</sup> 1277.iii.19 = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no. 368, p.144; 1285.vi.15 = *ibid*, no.378, p.332.



Turchia, referred to "*frumentum et omni aliud bladum*"<sup>1</sup>. In the complaint of Petro Castolum and Andrea Vendelino against the Byzantines, their ship was loaded with "*frumento et milio et fabis*". The ship was captured at Ania and taken to Butrino and almost all the "*blando*" off-loaded. The merchants lost "*frumenti, milio et fabis*". Afterwards the ship "*cum aliqua parte dicti blandi*" was returned and they included in their claim for damages the expenses incurred in getting back "*dicta navi et blando illo pauco*"<sup>2</sup>. Here *bladum* does appear to have a more general meaning than *frumentum*, including on this occasion grain/corn, millet (*milium*) and beans (*faba*). From these examples it appears that *bladum* was a general term for grain while *frumentum* was more specific, meaning wheat.

*Granum* was commonly used and seems to be equivalent to *frumentum*. It is translated by Evans as wheat<sup>3</sup>. That *granum* was distinct from *bladum* is indicated by the different treatment in Pegolotti of two distinct commodities. Pegolotti refers to *biado* being sold in and exported from Theologos while also discussing the expenses involved in taking *grano* out of the same area<sup>4</sup>.

It is quite clear that *ordeum* and *frumentum* were distinct commodities, though often cited together in the

---

<sup>1</sup> 1345.i.24 = Chrysosytomides, 'Venetian Commercial Privileges', doc.3, p.332.

<sup>2</sup> 1278.iii. = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.370, pp.243-244.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.420.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.56.

sources. The phrase "frumento et ordeo" appears in the complaint of Giovanni Barocio, robbed when going to Negroponte with his ship loaded with "frumento et ordeo et aliis mercationibus" and in a complaint of Giovanni de Pagano whose ship too was loaded with "frumento et ordeo"<sup>1</sup>. In the treaties between Venice and Menteşe of 1331, 1337, 1375, 1403 and 1407 *frumentum* was charged a customs tax of two *aspers* per *modio* while *ordeum* was charged at a rate of one *asper* per *modio*<sup>2</sup>. *Granum* was also something clearly different from *ordeum*. In the 1387 treaty between Murad I and the Genoese, the Genoese were to be taxed at a reduced rate for "grani ordeï milli et alliorum leguminum"<sup>3</sup>. *Bladum* too was distinct from *ordeum*. In the complaint of Antonio Squaia against the customs officials of Mesembria over "frumento et ordeo pro commercio, accepto sibi de ipso blando per illos de Mesembria et de ordeo multo sibi accepto per lo Mangatriarcha, ..., et propter moram, quam fecerat ibi per VIII dies mandato dicti Mengatriarche cum alio blando contra suam voluntatem", *bladum* and *ordeum* appear as two distinct items<sup>4</sup>.

Of the three terms commonly used in the Latin sources,

---

<sup>1</sup> 1278.iii. = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.370, pp.180, 233. See also *ibid*, p.240.

<sup>2</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187, 1337.pre iv. = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 20, p.198, 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 20, p.222, 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, 1403M DVL, clause 20, p.230, 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 20, 236.

<sup>3</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segretto, Materie Politiche 2729, no.26; Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 5, p.15.

<sup>4</sup> 1278.iii. = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.370, p.246. *Mangatriarcha* was the Greek official, *Megatriesarcham*, *ibid*.

*frumentum* and *granum* appear to have had the same meaning, wheat, while *bladum* was a wider term for grain in general. It is not possible to be precise about the type of grain involved when the term used is *bladum* or *semen*, another term similar in scope, as in the phrase "*frumentum et alia semina*"<sup>1</sup>. But the two words commonly applied in the Latin sources to grain exported from Turchia, *granum* and *frumentum*, allow one to suggest that what western Anatolia exported mostly was wheat, together with barley (*ordeum*). That western Anatolia was predominantly a wheat and barley producing area is supported by Aşıkpaşazade's reference to Bayezid's troops buying wheat ("buğday") and barley ("arpa") in Konya around 797-8/1394-5<sup>2</sup>. This is also supported by Gregoras's use of the word οἶτος when talking of the grain of Turchia<sup>3</sup>.

Perhaps of the two, wheat was the more important<sup>4</sup>. In the early part of the reign of Mehmed II, the Sultan ordered infidels of the *hass* villages of Constantinople and Galata to

---

<sup>1</sup> 1304.iii. = Belgrano, 'Documenti', no.10, p.109.

<sup>2</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), pp.64-65; (Istanbul), pp.71-72.

<sup>3</sup> Gregoras, II, p.687, 1.

<sup>4</sup> This was certainly the case in north eastern Anatolia in the area round Tokat where in c. 1455 wheat formed 45% and barley 20% of total agricultural production in Cinife, while in Venk at the same date wheat formed 65.5% and barley 30.7% of total production. The figures for Yıldız c.1455 were 63.5% for wheat and 36.4% for barley. See İslamoğlu-İnan, 'State and peasants', p.142.

plant one *mudd* of wheat, 0.5 of barley and 0.5 of oats each<sup>1</sup>. Apart from showing that these were presumably the common grains grown in this period, it also gives an idea of the importance of wheat. A Venetian document of 1345 too perhaps allows one to argue that what western Anatolia exported particularly was wheat for the word used for grain exported from Turchia was *frumentum*, the word *bladum* being used for the Byzantine Empire. The Venetian Senate was concerned that Venetian merchants were being charged *comerchium* unjustly in Phokaea on "frumento nato in partibus Turchie". This was contrary to their treaty relations under which Venetians "libertatem habent extrahendi et conducendi frumentum et omne aliud bladum de partibus imperii vestri, excepto frumentum nato in imperio, libere et absolute absque dacio, comerclo vel alia gravitate. Unde manifestum est quod frumentum conductum de partibus Turchie potest per nostros libere extrahi, cum partes unde frumentum predictum conducitur non intelligantur sub dominio vestri imperii".

It is possible that Aydın may have been predominantly a wheat producing area. While wheat and barley appear in the treaties between Venice and Menteşe throughout the fourteenth century, grain is not mentioned in the 1337 treaty between Aydın and Venice while in that of 1353 the clause concerning tax on grain refers to "frumentum vel alia victualia vel

---

<sup>1</sup> Post 1354.iv.18 or end of 1458 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.37, p.51; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.38, pp.119-120

legumina" which were charged at 4%<sup>1</sup>. Could this mean that while Menteşe produced and exported wheat and barley, Aydın produced only wheat, or that it was wheat alone which was exported by the Venetians? This relies on the word *victualia* meaning something different from grain. But a clause in the 1387 treaty between Murad I and the Genoese *victualia* is used clearly meaning grain. Under this clause the Genoese were granted freedom to "victualibus honerari solvendo ... pro quolibet modio Romanie grani ordeï milli et aliorum leguminum illud quod solvent Saraceni Greci Veneti et aliteri qui minus solvent"<sup>2</sup>.

Western Anatolia was an important source of grain in the eastern Mediterranean and one which the Genoese, and other western city states, used constantly. The *Officium Victualium* of Genoa sent in 1374-5 representatives to buy grain in Turchia, concluding a 4,000 *mines* contract with one of them, Lanzarotto Cattaneo, and instructing another, Leonardo Tartaro to buy in Turchia barley and grain at whatever price he wished<sup>3</sup>. The Genoese were certainly buying wheat, barley and millet from the Ottomans in 1387<sup>4</sup>. By analogy with the treaties between Venice and the emirs of Menteşe and Aydın, it would seem reasonable to assume that

---

<sup>1</sup> 1353.iv.7 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1353A, clause 19, p.214.

<sup>2</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segreto, Materie Politiche 2729, doc. 26; Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 5, p.15.

<sup>3</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.752, 759, citing ASG, Manoscritti no.104.

<sup>4</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segretto, Materie Politiche 2729, no.26; Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 5, p.15.

for the Genoese too, grain was an important item in their trade with these beyliks. Wheat and grain were sold in and exported from Theologos in the fourteenth century<sup>1</sup> and Genoese merchants are known to have exported grain from there<sup>2</sup>. Phokaea too was an important port used by the Genoese for grain exports. Grain from both Phokaea and Theologos was imported into Genoa in 1381, 1382, 1384, 1391 and 1393<sup>3</sup>. It was not only to Genoa that Anatolian grain was exported. In 1381 Steffano and Carolo Cataneo acting for Raffaele de Castro bought 1,800 *modii* of wheat from Phokaea which they transported to Famagusta and handed over to Precivali Cibo, Podestà and consilius of the state of Cyprus, in accordance with the agreement made for the Comune with Raffaele<sup>4</sup>. In 1389 Torpeto Malocello was sent by the Podestà of Pera to buy 2,000 *mines* of grain for Genoa in Caffa, the Black Sea or Phokaea<sup>5</sup>. In 1393 two ships loaded with grain at Panados and at Phokaea<sup>6</sup>. Tarsus too was a grain market for the Genoese. In 1300 Antonio, son of Musso, went with 100 silver *bessants* to buy grain in Tarsus and Armenia and return with it to Cyprus<sup>7</sup>. Wheat and barley were sold in and

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.55, 56.

<sup>2</sup> 1344.viii.9 : Balard et al., *Documents*, no.46, pp.27-28.

<sup>3</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.754.

<sup>4</sup> 1382.xi.7 = ASG, Antico Comune 16 (Communis Ianuae Massaria), f.64r.

<sup>5</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.761.

<sup>6</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.762.

<sup>7</sup> 1300.xii.2 = Polonia, no.139, pp.155-156

exported from Antalya<sup>1</sup> in the first half of the fourteenth century and it would seem reasonable to assume that Genoese merchants were involved there too in the grain trade.

The Genoese on Chios were active in buying grain from the Turks. In 1414 Sipahi Bayezid ("Sapihi Bayezit quondam Jhacsi, Turchus de Cazali isich obasi") a Turk of some importance to judge from his title, acknowledged to the notary Giovanni Balbi, acting for Domenico Giustiniano, that he had received full payment for all the goods, monies and wheat which he, "Sapihi Bayaxit", had on any occasion sold to Domenico. The document was enacted in Chios and the witnesses included one Greek, Micalli Verioti de Fliis Veteribus Grecho and two Turks, Bayrambey Turcho de Smirris (Izmir) quondam Ezedim (İzzeddin), Elies (İlyas) Turcho de Smirris (Izmir) quondam Tagdira (?) and the interpreter, Cristoforo Picenino, "interpetre Cive Chii", who translated the deed from Turkish into Latin at the request of Sipahi Bayezid<sup>2</sup>. The document reads as if Sipahi Bayezid had been in the habit of providing Domenico with goods and that this was a general statement to the effect that Domenico now owed nothing for any of the deals. Its importance is perhaps reinforced by the large number of witnesses (seven).

Cüneyd Bey, the ruler of Aydın at that time, was

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.39.

<sup>2</sup>1414.vii.16 = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1, doc.311. "Jhacsi" is probably, by analogy with the Latin *Ihallabi* for *Çelebi*, a Latin rendering of a Turkish name beginning with *Çe*, while "cazali", meaning a small settlement, shows that "isich obasi" is a place name, of which the second word is probably *ovası* (? Ece Ovası). See Appendix One, doc.14.

involved in selling grain to Chios, a trade which it would seem reasonable to assume was a useful source of income for him. In 1414 the Podestà of Chios, Paulo de Montaldo, held an investigation into the tax position of the Jew Magister Moyses de Meir, citizen and inhabitant of Chios and a doctor ("fixitum"). Moyses was exempt from taxation but had been charged for payment he had made to Cüneyd Bey ("Jonayt Bey Turchus") and for wheat, which had been distributed by the officials for the provisioning of Chios. Moyses was absolved from these taxes, for receiving the wheat and for the money whether the money was handed to a Turk or was handed over by a Turk<sup>1</sup>.

Other western merchants, as well as the Genoese, frequented Turchia in search of grain. In the 1270s Venetians loaded wheat at Fetiye (Makre, Meğri) for Giovanni Bembo, having sailed from Negroponte to Fetiye where he loaded wheat and wine, was attacked there and his cargo seized<sup>2</sup>. In the same period, grain was being sold at İncir Liman (Paralimne). In 1278 Nicolo Dente and Filippo Bono, needing to prepare their ship, off-loaded, within the territories of the Byzantine Emperor, their cargo of wheat from the Crimea which they intended to transport to Venice. When they wished to re-load and leave for Venice, they were prevented from doing so and the wheat was kept locked and under guard. Ultimately they were able to obtain imperial

---

<sup>1</sup> 1414.iii.18 = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1, doc.288. See Appendix One, doc.12.

<sup>2</sup> 1278.iii = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.370, pp.196-197.



permission to sell, but sold at a loss ("male vendiderint") at İncir Liman<sup>1</sup>. The Venetians bought and exported wheat and barley from the emirates of Aydın and Menteşe during the fourteenth century<sup>2</sup>. In 1376 the Genoese, annoyed by Venetian seizure of Tenedos, attacked Venetian ships sailing from Crete to Theologos to load grain<sup>3</sup>. The Venetians also traded in grain with the Ottomans. In 1333 the Signoria decided that officials of Crete should themselves handle the agreement with Orhan for the import into Crete of horses and grain<sup>4</sup>. Venetians also imported grain from Turchia into Constantinople for in 1342 they were complaining of Byzantine attempts to tax them on grain they had imported from Phokaea and other places, formerly Byzantine but which were by then in Turkish hands<sup>5</sup>. The Venetians were still complaining three years later about Byzantine attempts to tax them on grain from Phokaea<sup>6</sup>. In 1437 Antonio de Negropone bought 26 *moza* of grain ("formenti") in Samsun at 85 *aspers* of Samsun, equivalent, at an exchange rate of 19 *aspers* of Samsun to one

---

<sup>1</sup> 1278.iii = Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.370, p.266

<sup>2</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadhou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187; 1337.pre iv. = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 20, p.198; 1353.iv.7 = *ibid*, doc.1353A, clause 19, p.214; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 20, pp.221-222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M; 1403M DVL, clause 20, p.230; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 20, p.236.

<sup>3</sup> 1376 = Chrysostomides, 'Caroldo', p.177, pp.176-177.

<sup>4</sup> 1333.xi.16 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, doc.38, pp.30-31.

<sup>5</sup> 1342.iii.16 = Chrysostomides, 'Venetian Privileges', no.2, pp.330-331.

<sup>6</sup> 1345.i.24 = Chrysostomides, 'Venetian Privileges', no.3, pp.331-333.

<sup>p</sup>  
*hyperpyron*, to 116.3 *hyperpyra*<sup>1</sup>.

The Hospitalers too bought grain in Turchia. In 1379 the Pope Clement VII was prompted by the problems besetting the Hospitalers, disease, depopulation and Turkish attacks, to allow them to import grain and other foodstuffs from Turchia<sup>2</sup>.

Ragusan merchants traded in grain from Turchia. In 1451 a Ragusan was to buy grain in Antalya and take it Alexandria<sup>3</sup>. In 1453 the emir of Alexandria forced a Ragusan merchant to take 500 ducats to buy a cargo of grain in Cyprus and Antalya and transport it to Alexandria. When the merchant did not reach his destination, the emir forced another Ragusan to pay half the cost of 100 *ribebe* of grain which the emir should have received<sup>4</sup>. The Byzantines too imported grain from Turchia into the empire, though by now rarely<sup>5</sup>.

The Turchian market was not always able to supply requirements. The Genoese had on occasion to provide Cyprus with grain when Famagusta was not able to obtain enough on the local markets or import sufficient from Turchia. Sicilian grain was sent to Cyprus in 1383, 1386, 1388, 1390,

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.152, p.306.

<sup>2</sup> 1379.viii.6 = Luttrell, 'Intrigue', p.35, citing Reg. Aven. 215, 260r-v.

<sup>3</sup> 1451.i.18 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, no.1201, p.368.

<sup>4</sup> 1453.i.5 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, no.1258, pp.379-380.

<sup>5</sup> Gregoras, II, pp.686-687.

1391, 1392, 1393, 1394, 1397<sup>1</sup>. Crete, on the other hand, was itself a grain-producing area and thus only rarely imported grain from the west<sup>2</sup>. At the beginning of the fifteenth century bad harvests in Romania and Turchia forced Chian merchants to go to Apulia for grain. 1404 they even went as far as Catalonia<sup>3</sup>.

While it is clear that Turchia was an important grain supplying region, it was perhaps of the three main sources of grain in the eastern Mediterranean, Thrace, the Black Sea region and Turchia, the least important, the Black Sea being much more of a bulk supplier. This is reflected in a letter of Vannino Fecini written to Pignol Zucchello from Crete in May 1347 in which he comments, after quoting the price of grain in Crete and Balat (Palatia), that he believes the market for grain and other commodities was now better because peace had been made in Tana and many ships had gone there<sup>4</sup>. In 1384 Phokaea and Theologos provided Genoa with 3,710 *mines* of grain in comparison, in the same year, with 31,919 from Romania and 31,344 from Caffa. These figures together made up 77% of the known grain imports for that year<sup>5</sup>. According

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.764.

<sup>2</sup> Zachariadou, 'Prix', p.292.

<sup>3</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.764-765, citing ASG, Notario Gregorio Panisario.

<sup>4</sup> 1347.v.16 = Zucchello, no.36, p.73. "ma io credo che ora megliora merchato di formento e d'assai altre cose peroche' la pacie de la Tana è fatta, e molte navi so' andate dentro".

<sup>5</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.760 and note 121 citing ASG, Antico Commune, Magistrorum *rationalium*.

to Professor Balard's figures, grain from Phokaea in 1391 made up 0.5% of the grain imported into Genoa that year and 9% for 1392/3. Phokaea grain does not figure in his table for 1390<sup>1</sup>. There thus seems to be a considerable fluctuation in the amount imported, from 0% in 1390 to 9% in 1392/3. Ottoman activity in this period was undoubtedly disrupting the grain trade. However the explanation for this fluctuation may lie more in the randomness of the sources than in the political situation, for if the fluctuation was due to Ottoman advances one might expect a decline from 1390 to 1392/3 rather than an increase in grain exports.

The importance of Turchia as a grain market fluctuated according to external factors such as the accessibility of other grain-producing areas or according to internal political events such as attack or Ottoman activity. Difficulties in other grain supplying regions or times of scarcity resulted in an increase in the amount of grain exported from Turchia. In 1269, a year of famine in Italy, Genoese and Venetian merchants exported grain into Italy from Turchia<sup>2</sup>. In 1343 the troubles in the Crimean region with the Tatar Han resulted in the decline of that region as a source of grain, the Han forbidding export from his

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.762.

<sup>2</sup> Martin da Canal, 650, 654. According to Bratianu, 'Approvisionnement', p.96, citing da Canal, this is the first time that the Venetians and the Genoese imported into Italy from, among other places, Turchia. But 650 has nothing about Turks and neither 650 nor 654 mention Genoese: "Tatars, Alan, Giquis, Rous, Turs, Armins et Gres donerent la vitaille as Veneciens a celui tens", 654.

territories, and the subsequent rise in the importance of Turchia as a market. But in 1347 this importance declined because of the re-opening of Tana<sup>1</sup>. In 1386 Caffa, at war with the Tatars of Solgat, was forced to import grain from, among other places, Turchia and at this time only Turchia and Cyprus were good grain markets<sup>2</sup>.

Local political events also affected Turchia as a market for grain. In 1344 Turchia became closed to western merchants. From 1341 relations between Aydın and the western states were deteriorating as Aydın's military power increased. A crusade was organized to counter the threat posed by Aydın and an attack launched on the beylik in the summer of 1344. The port of Izmir was occupied in October. In a letter written from Candia and dated 5 October 1344, Domino Pingniuolo, Giannino Pingniuolo and Franciescho Bartolomei reported that there was at that time no movement to or from Turchia<sup>3</sup>. A total break in trade relations did not, however, persist for long and by the spring of the following year Venetian merchants were once more trading in western Anatolia<sup>4</sup>. Relations were apparently not put on a firm footing again until the enactment of a treaty between Aydın and Venice in 1353.

Ottoman advances and the consequent political upheaval

---

<sup>1</sup> 1347.v.16 = Zucchello, no.36, p.73.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.761, citing 1386.ix.4, AS Prato, Carteggio Pisa da Genova, no.508.

<sup>3</sup> 1344.x.5 = Zucchello, no.9, p.25.

<sup>4</sup> 1346.iii.17 = Zucchello, no.24, p.54.

of the 1390s reduced the reliability of Turchia as a secure source of grain. From 1394 the Genoese could no longer rely on the eastern grain markets and it was not until 1402 that Turkish grain shipped from Chios once again appeared in the Genoese markets. Traffic in Turkish grain remained sluggish for several years, not really picking up until around 1406. But by then the Genoese has started looking west for supplies, deterred from the markets of western Anatolia and the Black Sea by the new political conditions<sup>1</sup>. According to Professor Balard, there was nothing as irregular as the eastern grain trade at end of fourteenth century<sup>2</sup>

Apart from the instability caused to markets by Ottoman territorial advances, absorbing as they did the grain-growing regions of the beyliks, it appears that the Ottomans, apparently in contrast to the emirs of Menteşe and Aydın, controlled and manipulated the markets, actively seeking to use their economic muscle to improve their relations with western states. One way in which they did this was to control the flow of goods. Bayezid certainly controlled the export of grain from his territories. It appears that during his reign the Genoese could not always export grain freely from the ports of Turchia. In 1390 a Venetian citizen, Lodisio Bregadino, brought a complaint before the Podestà of Pera, Antonio Leardo, against Jane de Drapperiis, burgensis of Pera. Lodisio had bought grain from Jane but Jane had, according to the complaint, failed to hand over part of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.763.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.768.

grain at the agreed time and agreed place. Lodisio therefore requested that Jane hand over 1,000 *modio* of grain in Pannidos or one of the ports of Greece where ships customarily loaded or in Turchia "videlicet in locis et scalis dominacionis domini Ihallabi turchi, videlicet a Buccha Avis citra". Lodisio further requested that Jane hand over 2,000 *modio* of grain at Lo Porro or Pannidos or some other place in Greece where ships customarily loaded "videlicet a Bucha Avis citra" or in loading places of Turchia ("in locis Turchie carregatoriis") but specifies in only one or two of these places, in Camalı or this side of Scorpiata ("Scorpiata citra"), it being known that Lodisio always had free passage from these places for that quantity of grain ("ipsis duobus locis comprehensis, ita quod semper libere dictus Lodisius a dictis locis de dicto frumento supradicte quantitatis liberam habeat")<sup>1</sup>. This presumably means either that these two Turkish ports, Camalı and Scorpiata, as distinct from other Turkish ports, were always open, or that Lodisio had some special arrangement either with Bayezid or with some local official. If the latter, it would be most interesting to know how such arrangements were come to, whether they were official or whether Lodisio had bribed an individual official. Without further evidence however, it is not possible even to speculate.

In 1390, after his capture of Mentese and Aydın,

---

<sup>1</sup> 1390.iii.2 = Mussa, *Navigazione*, no.5, pp.236-240.

Bayezid forbade the export of grain<sup>1</sup>. Bayezid also forbade the export of grain from Macedonia<sup>2</sup>. In 1400 the emir of Aydın (Theologos), described as lord Zalapı (ie Çelebi), son of Bayezid, identified by Thiriet as probably Süleyman, then governor of Aydın<sup>3</sup>, but by Zachariadou as probably Ertoğrul<sup>4</sup>, sent ambassadors to Crete to tell the Venetians of his friendly feelings towards them. His ambassadors were to reassure the Venetians that their ships were welcome to trade in Aydın and export whatever goods they wished with the exception of cereals, timber and horses. In return, the emir requested Venetian support in any power struggle with his brothers. Venice, pleased with the emir's friendly attitude, advised the Cretan authorities to send an ambassador instructed to try and procure freedom of trade for horses and grain. In the event of a struggle with his brothers, the ambassadors were to restrict themselves to offering the emir assylum either in Crete or in some other Venetian territory<sup>5</sup>.

One can compare the policy of the Ottomans with that pursued in 1343 by the Tatar Han who, in his struggle with

---

<sup>1</sup> Dukas, (Bonn), p.47, 11-13; (Bucharest), p.75, 16-17; Noiret, *Documents*, 1390, p.36, 1396, p.74, 1400, pp.110-111.

<sup>2</sup> Thiriet, *Romanie Vénétienne*, p.364.

<sup>3</sup> Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, p.12.

<sup>4</sup> Zachariadou, 'Ertogrul Bey il Sovrano di Teologo (Efeso)', in *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria*, N.S., vol. LXXIX, (Genoa, 1965), p.158.

<sup>5</sup> 1400.iii.19 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, doc.988, pp.12-13; Noiret, *Documents*, pp.110-111; Iorga, *Notices et Extraits*, I, p.102.



the Venetians, forbade the export of grain from his state<sup>1</sup>. The Han forced western merchants out of the ports on Black Sea under his control, so driving the Venetians out of Tana. In retaliation, the Venetians imposed a ban on their merchants' entering the Han's territory. The subsequent prohibition on the export of grain enforced by the Han resulted in an immediate scarcity of the commodity in Constantinople. The situation persisted for two years, the Genoese refusing to join the Venetians in their proposed commercial boycott of Tatar lands, until lack of grain forced the Venetians to capitulate. In 1347 the Venetians reversed the prohibition on trade in Tatar territories and, shortly afterwards, a treaty was concluded between them and the Han<sup>2</sup>.

It is interesting to speculate on whether there was any economic policy similar to Ottoman control of the flow of grain followed by the emirs of Menteşe or Aydın, or if there was any difference in the policy pursued by the two beyliks. In this respect it may be significant that in Menteşe the tax charged on grain remained the same throughout the fourteenth century. Bearing in mind the fluctuations of the market and the great importance, on occasions, for western states of grain exports from western Anatolia, coupled with the effect of inflation, it seems remarkable that the same figure should have been levied from the treaty of 1331 up to that of 1407. This might perhaps be taken as indicative of a lack of firm

---

<sup>1</sup> Morozzo della Roca, *Notizie*, nos.281, 285.

<sup>2</sup> Zachariadou, *Prix*, pp.295-296. Morozzo della Rocca, *Notizie*, pp.281, 285.

economic management by Menteşe and a willingness to accept a position favourable to Venice rather than, when possible, to dictate terms to her. Aydın, on the other hand, may have been more dominant in its handling of the grain trade. There was certainly no trade in the area in 1344 at the time of the crusade launched by western states against the beylik<sup>1</sup>. Perhaps, in a move similar to that of the Tatar Han in the same period, the emir of Aydın prohibited the export of grain from his territories. That there was at this time a breach of treaty arrangements is clear from Marcha di Marco Batagli da Rimini and it was presumably the Turks of Aydın who broke the arrangement as the response, again according to Marcha di Marco Batagli da Rimini, was the western crusade against Izmir<sup>2</sup>. It would certainly not have been in western interests to lose this source of grain.

Fluctuations in the price of grain from Turchia were due in large part to the availability of the commodity, which depended on the political position of the time. The actions of the Tatar Han in 1343 against the Venetians resulted in an immediate scarcity of grain which the Venetians were forced to make up by importing from Asia Minor and caused a price rise. Once peace had been made in Tana in 1347, however, ships were able to return to the area and the price dropped in Romania from eight or nine *hyperpyra per mogio* to five to six *hyperpyra per mogio*<sup>3</sup>. In Crete and Constantinople prices

---

<sup>1</sup> 1344.x.5 = Zucchello, no.9, p.25.

<sup>2</sup> Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini, pp.50-51

<sup>3</sup> 1347.v.16 = Zucchello, no.36, p.73.

of grain were high in 1343-1347, then fell, rising again in the 1390s. This seems, as Professor Zachariadou has suggested, to be the result of the political position in one of the main grain-supplying regions, western Asia Minor<sup>1</sup>. In 1386 Caffa, occupied with fighting the Tatars of Solgat, was not able to supply grain to Genoa and the price in Sicily rose to 50% above the normal cost<sup>2</sup>. In the same way, the level of Turkish activity had a direct result on grain prices. In the 1390s the difficult situation for Constantinople, with Bayezid's siege of the city beginning in 1391, was reflected by high prices in Pera<sup>3</sup>. Fear of Turkish attack resulted in a short supply of foodstuffs in Pera in 1392 as people's attention was not on harvesting and trading. The slow down in trading activity was reflected in the availability of goods and in prices<sup>4</sup>. The price of grain of 20 *hyperpyra* in 1399-1400 was due, according to Dukas, to the Turkish siege of Constantinople.

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.164.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.761 and note 124, referring to the archives of Prato.

<sup>3</sup> 1392.x.11 = Massa, *Alcune Lettere*, no.2, p.357

<sup>4</sup> 1392.x.5 = Massa, *Alcune Lettere*, no.1, p.356: Le cose di qua stanno a l'usato: nulla o pocho si fa di mercantia, prima perchè s'atendea i' re d'Ungheria con grande sforzo in questo inperio; e però le cose stanno sospese; ora si dice se ne torna, che sarebe ria nuova, ma non è certa. Apresto, la moria ci fa grande danno; Idio ce ne deliveri. Per la prima cagione le vettuarie ci sono in carestia e penso le navi verranno vote, non perchè le ricolte non sieno grandi e buone, ma le novità tenghono gli uomini di qua sospesi. La cera vale perperi 29 o meglo, ch'è gran carestia e al pregio val costà non vi si può mettere simile. La più parte di cose si traghono di qua sono in carestia perchè non c'è incetta nessuna.

Grain was subject to various taxes in western Anatolia, the most important of which was customs. Grain exported from Aydın in about the 1320s was charged, presumably for Latins, at the rate of 4% while in Antalya in the same period the rate, again presumably for Latins, was six *aspers* per *modio*<sup>1</sup>. It is possible that in 1337 the rate on grain in Aydın, paid by the Venetians, was 6% as this was the rate applied to those commodities measured by the *seruch*<sup>2</sup>. There is however no clause specifying a charge on grain in the treaty of that year. From 1331 to 1407 the rate in Menteşe for Venetians was two *aspers* per *modio* for wheat and one *asper* per *modio* for barley and legumes<sup>3</sup>. The Ottomans too charged a special rate for grain. Under the treaty enacted in 1387 between Murad I and the Genoese it was stipulated that the Genoese were to pay on each Romania *modio* of wheat, barley and millet, at the same rate as that paid by the Arabs, (or Muslims), Greeks, Venetians and others who were granted a reduced rate<sup>4</sup>. The rate paid by the Genoese on grain in the reign of Murad I was perhaps half a *hyperpyron* per *modio*,

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.56, 58.

<sup>2</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 7, p.191. The *seruch* seems to have been a capacity measure used for grain which may have been, according to Professor Zachariadou's calculations, the equivalent of 60-62 litres, *ibid*, p.149.

<sup>3</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187; 1337.pre iv = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 20, p.198; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 20, pp.221-222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, 1403M DVL, clause 20, p.230; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 20, p.236.

<sup>4</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segretto, Materie Politiche 2729, no.26; Fleet, 'Treaty', 'clause 5, p.15.

since in 1384 the Venetian Senate instructed its ambassador to Murad, Marino Malipetro, to try and persuade Murad to agree to Venetians loading and exporting grain from his ports without paying any tax. If however Murad would not agree, Marino Malipetro was instructed to accept a rate not higher than half a *hyperpyron* per *modio*<sup>1</sup>. The clause in the 1387 treaty makes it clear that Murad did not in fact agree to any such exemption. In 1390 the Venetian ambassador, Francesco Querini, after paying his respects and passing on the condolences of the Comune of Venice for the death of Murad, was ordered to attempt to persuade Bayezid to grant Venice freedom from tax when exporting grain from his ports. If Bayezid was not agreeable, then Querini was to agree to a tax of up to one *hyperpyron* per *modio*, while assuring the Ottoman ruler that the grain was for Venice or Venetian territories only<sup>2</sup>. Grain was now at a premium as Bayezid, who had recently conquered two very important sources of grain, Aydın and Menteşe, had forbidden its export from these areas<sup>3</sup>. In 1403 Süleyman charged the Latins and Greeks exporting grain from his territories, that is the European section of the by now fragmented empire, at the rate of one *hyperpyron* per *mozo* of Constantinople<sup>4</sup>, the same rate apparently applying to

---

<sup>1</sup> 1384.vii.22 = DVL, II, no. 116 p.194.

<sup>2</sup> 1390.iii.6, ASV Senato, Misti 41, f.59r = *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca*, no.68.

<sup>3</sup> Dukas, (Bonn), p.47, 11-13; (Bucharest), p.75, 16-17.

<sup>4</sup> 1403 = Dennis, '1403', clause 13, p.79.

Negroponte<sup>1</sup>. Therefore presumably the rate of tax in 1387 on grain was not less than half and not more than one *hyperpyron*. Later, during the reign of Mehmed II, imported grain was charged on the seller in Istanbul at the rate of 4%, "Edrene `adeti üzre" (according to the custom of Edirne)<sup>2</sup>. This presumably means that the rate of 4% was that charged when the empire had its capital at Edirne before the conquest of Constantinople. 4% was levied after January 1476 on grain imported into various ports from Istanbul to the borders of Aydınli from Muslims and tributaries while 5% was charged on non-tributaries<sup>3</sup>. It is interesting, when comparing these figures, that 4% was charged on export in Aydın, presumably on Latins, in approximately the 1320s and the same rate of 4% was charged, this time for imported grain, before 1476 under the Ottomans or, after January 1476, 5% for non-tributaries and 4% for Muslims and tributaries. If one compares the rates given in *aspers* or *hyperpyra* per *modio*, that of Antalya, six *aspers* per *modio* (equivalent roughly to 0.5 of a *hyperpyron*<sup>4</sup>), during approximately the 1320s, is high in contrast with that of Menteşe which

---

<sup>1</sup> *ibid*, clause 22, p.80.

<sup>2</sup> 1476.i.14 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.33, pp.44-45; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.33, clause 2, p.109; c.1476.i.14 = Anhegger and İnalcık, no.34, p.47; Beldiceanu, no.35, clause 2, pp.111-112.

<sup>3</sup> Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.35, pp.47-48; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clause 4, p.114.

<sup>4</sup> 22.6 akçe to the ducat, 1 ducat to two *hyperpyra*, thus 5.65 akçe to 0.5 of a *hyperpyron*, see Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.140, basing her argument on al-`Umari.

remained at two *aspers* per *modio* of grain and one *asper* per *modio* ( c. 0.1 of a *hyperpyron*) of barley and legumes from 1331 until 1407. The Ottomans in contrast probably charged between 0.5 of a *hyperpyron* and one *hyperpyron* under Murad I and levied one *hyperpyron* under Süleyman. This is in sharp contrast to that charged in Menteşe, which also contrasts with the higher rate charged in Antalya, though this too was lower than that levied in the Ottoman empire.

Apart from customs, grain was subject to various other taxes, one of which was brokerage (*senseraggio*). In Antalya one *asper* per *moggio* of wheat was paid for *assaggio*<sup>1</sup>. Brokerage was also paid in Constantinople where wheat and grain were charged 4% *senseraggio*<sup>2</sup>. A market charge also existed in Antalya of three *aspers* per *moggio* of wheat for the market ("fonda")<sup>3</sup>. Wheat was charged a warehouse rent in Theologos at a rate of 1/5th of a gold *florin* per month per 100 *moggia* for the *loghiera* in the warehouse<sup>4</sup>. In Antalya the charge for warehouse rent was one *asper* per *moggio* of wheat which included a charge for transporting the grain from land to the ship<sup>5</sup>. There was also a charge for transporting in Theologos where hiring animals to take the wheat out of the city to the sea, nine *miglia* by land, cost

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.45.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.56.

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

2.5 gold *florins* per 100 *moggia*<sup>1</sup>.

Grain was essential for the survival of the western city states and was, in consequence, an extremely important element in their trade. Although Turchia was not perhaps the most important grain source for states such as Genoa and Venice, it nevertheless supplied large quantities and, when political factors affected other suppliers, became a source of the utmost importance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.56.



### SECTION 3: ALUM

A major commodity in Genoese trade with Anatolia in the later Middle Ages was alum, a colourless crystalline substance procured from certain rocks which was used for a variety of industries and also in medicine, and was extremely important in the European cloth industry, where it was used in dying as a fixer and for cleansing fibres<sup>1</sup>. A further benefit for merchants was that alum acted as ballast in their ships<sup>2</sup>.

The process involved in producing alum was fairly lengthy and consisted of a series of boilings, soakings and dryings<sup>3</sup>. Two basic grades of alum were produced: rock alum and grain alum. Rock alum, the best and most expensive type, was that which stuck to the basin edges in the last stage of the processing, while the alum at the bottom of the basin was called *allume corda* or *allume di fosso* and was a poor quality alum<sup>4</sup>. This was grain alum, (*allume minuto*) and was the alum of everyday use<sup>5</sup>. *Allume di sorta della buona luminiera* was second quality alum, made up of 2/5th rock and 3/5th grain

---

<sup>1</sup> Alum was also used in the leather industry, in making certain types of glass and in the sugar industry: Faroghi, 'Alum production', pp.154-155; Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.167; Balard, *La Romanie Génoise*, II, p.769; Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce*, II, p.570; Delumeau, *L'alun*, p.14; Liagre, 'Commerce de l'alun', pp.177-179.

<sup>2</sup> Faroghi, 'Alum production', p.153.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, pp.367-368; Dukas (Bonn), p.160, 12 - p.161, 7; Dukas (Bucharest), p.205, 7-19.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.368.

<sup>5</sup> Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.38, n.26; Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, p.cxxxix, n.3.

alum<sup>1</sup>.

According to Pegolotti, the bigger (*grosso*) and less grainy (*minuto*), the whiter, brighter, clearer and clearer of stones and sandy soil the alum was, the better it was<sup>2</sup>. The quality of alum varied according to where it came from.

Mining, production and export of alum in Anatolia was very much in the hands of the Genoese who, from an early date, dominated this trade. William of Rubruck, who was in Konya in 1255, met a Genoese merchant there, Nicolao de Santo-Siro, who, together with a Venetian called Benefatio de Molendino, had a monopoly of all the alum in Turchia, the Sultan selling only to them. In consequence the price was, according to Rubruck, about 22% higher than it should have been<sup>3</sup>. In the early fourteenth century the Zaccaria family, later followed by the Cattanea della Volta, controlled alum extraction. After 1346, the Maona of Chios was predominant, controlling Phokaea and neighbouring islands. Ten years later, in 1356, the Gattilusio family, having establishing themselves on Lesbos, controlled the alum production there and on the other islands in the northern Aegean. It was through them that the Genoese gained the farms of the mines

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.411-412.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, pp.368-369, 369-370.

<sup>3</sup> William of Rubruck, p.273; MS 66A, ff.109r col.1 -109v col 1; MS 181, f.396. Nicolao and Benefatio increased the price so that alum which should have cost 15 besants sold for 50 besants. Balard, *Romanie Genoise*, II, p.770, note 4, considers this to be alum from Kütahya which was closer to Konya than Karahisar. But Rubruck refers to all Turchia.

in Turchia<sup>1</sup>. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century the Genoese merchant Francesco Draperio gained a position of great importance in the alum trade<sup>2</sup> and various Genoese families, such as the Lomellini, the Doria, the Paterio, the Adorno, the Salvagio and the Pallavicini, together with the Giustiniani, dominated alum export to the west<sup>3</sup>.

Alum extraction and export was sometimes in the hands of a partnership of western merchants, as it was in 1416 in Phokaea<sup>4</sup> and again in 1437 when a partnership farmed the alum under Murad II<sup>5</sup>. The size of such partnerships varied, Domenico Doria, for example, creating a small partnership in the 1440s to trade 8,000 *kantars* of alum per annum from Grecia and Turchia<sup>6</sup>, while a very large partnership of 500,000 *kantars*, in which Francesco Draperio owned half the capital, was formed in 1449. By this time there was apparently a problem of over production and falling prices

---

<sup>1</sup> Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.32.

<sup>2</sup> Francesco Draperio appears in various transactions entered into the accounts of Giacomo Badoer dealing with alum (1439.iii.21 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.310, p.622), oil (1437.ix.-. = *ibid*, c.45, p.90, c.99, p.201, of Messina; 1437.vii.5 = *ibid*, c.47, p.94, c.66, p.133, of Coron), wax, a slave (1437.xii.10 = c.143, p.288), sugar (1436.ii.14 = *ibid*, c.45, p.90) and copper (1437.xii.18 = *ibid*, c.143, p.288). He was a banker, being described as "Franzesco Drapieri banchier" or "Franzesco Drapieri dal bancho" (eg. c.47, p.94, c.143, p.288, c.148, p.298) and delt in letters of exchange, "letera de chanbio" (1437.vii.3 = *ibid*, c.143, p.288. "una letera de chanbio da Veniexa", 1439.iii.20 = *ibid*, c.320, p.643, again a letter of exchange from Venice).

<sup>3</sup> Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', pp.34, 38-39.

<sup>4</sup> Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.34.

<sup>5</sup> Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce*, II, p.40.

<sup>6</sup> 1448.i.4 in Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.37.

and this partnership was formed in an attempt to control the situation. It negotiated an agreement with the Lord of Lesbos, paying him 5,000 gold *ducats* of Chios a year in return for a moratorium on processing alum in Mitylene<sup>1</sup>.

While the trade in alum was largely in the hands of the Genoese, Turks too traded in this commodity. Francesco de Campis, when *apaltator* of Phokaea, bought 100 *kantars* of alum for 50 *ducats* from a Turk. Apparently the alum was never delivered and the Turk refused to hand back the money because of certain slaves, presumably his own, who had fled from Turchia to Phokaea. Francesco, by now *ex apaltator*, requested, in a case of arbitration in Chios, that he be paid the money he had handed over to the Turk, and the government of Chios agreed to 40 gold *ducats* being paid to him, Francesco ceding his rights against the Turk to the government of Chios. The 40 *ducats* were to be paid by the current *apaltators* from the money they had to deliver to the government of Chios and they were to make up this money in the following four months<sup>2</sup>.

Anatolia was one of the principal alum producing areas, exporting it to the east, to Egypt and Syria, and the west<sup>3</sup>. Alum was exported to Cyprus for ships carrying alum from

---

<sup>1</sup> Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', pp.31-32, 39-42. First payment under the Mitylene agreement, 1450.x.1 = Argenti, Chios, III, doc.128, pp.598-599.

<sup>2</sup> 1394.ii.18 = ASG, Not. Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filza 1, doc.97/240.

<sup>3</sup> Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', pp.45-49.

Turchia paid the *missa* tax there<sup>1</sup>. Turkish alum went further west and into northern Europe even reaching as far as England. It was traded in Bruges, appearing there in a list of alums dating from the first part of the fourteenth century<sup>2</sup>. In 1400 Antonio Cataneo was the owner and captain of a ship hired to take alum from Turchia to Bruges<sup>3</sup>. Ecluse was also a destination and market for Turkish alum as were Middlebourg, Sandwich and Southampton. 158 kantars of "aluminis turcheschi" together with some Kütahya alum en route for Ecluse were part of a security put up in Genoa in 1343<sup>4</sup>. In 1371 alum from Turchia appears in a list of goods taken from English ships or seized in Flanders and sold in Ecluse<sup>5</sup>; in 1388 and 1398 alum was loaded in Turchia for

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.85. He describes a tax called *missa* which was imposed for keeping the sea around Cyprus safe and was paid by the masters of ships carrying merchandise from Turchia, Rhodes, Armenia, Syria and Egypt. If the master of the ship was Genoese or Venetian he did not pay the tax as Venetians and Genoese were free from *comerchium* in Cyprus. In this case the tax was paid by the merchant whose goods were carried on the ship. Among the goods taxed was alum, taxed at 6 *karati* per sack. As Rhodes, Armenia, Syria and Egypt were not alum producing areas, the alum in question must have come from Turchia. It seems reasonable that alum exported from Antalya went to Cyprus, or Syria and Egypt. See Pegolotti, p.370.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, pp.243-244. These alums presumably also appeared in England as the equivalent of the Bruges *carica* of alum was given by Pegolotti for London.

<sup>3</sup> 1400.v.28 = Doehaerd-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, no.2, p.23.

<sup>4</sup> 1343.iv.10 = Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, no.127, pp.155-158.

<sup>5</sup> In 1371.viii.1 the English destroyed a Flemish fleet in the Channel. In reprisal, goods seized from the English were sold in Ecluse. There is an inventory of these goods dated 1371.viii.25 in the Bruges Archives, Liagre, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.191 and note 65. She refers to Gilliodts Van

Ecluse or Middelburg<sup>1</sup> and in 1393 alum from Turchia went to Southampton, Sandwich or Ecluse<sup>2</sup>. Later, in 1417, a ship with a cargo of merchandise including alum loaded at Old and New Phokaea was to go to Ecluse, calling at various ports en route including Southampton, provided that the Genoese and the English were at peace<sup>3</sup>. Spain also imported Turkish alum. In 1332 a request was made to Alfonso III, King of Aragon, for the return of alum of Turchia, confiscated in Roses<sup>4</sup>.

One of the main centres for alum production in Anatolia was Phokaea. The Genoese were established there<sup>5</sup> from 1275<sup>6</sup> or before, when the alum mines there were granted by Michael

---

Severn, *Inventaire des Archives de la Ville de Bruges*, II, no.6, p.118.

<sup>1</sup> 1388.i.13 = Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, no.503, p. 659; 1388.iv.7 = *ibid*, doc.521, pp.682-683; 1398.x.8 = *ibid*, no.623, p.825 (for Ecluse only).

<sup>2</sup> 1398.vi.28 = Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, no.565, pp. 746-751.

<sup>3</sup> 1417.i.6 = Doehaerd-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, no.230, pp.253-257.

<sup>4</sup> Casula, *Carta Reali Diplomatiche*, no.521, p.296.

<sup>5</sup> There were two Phokaeas, the original Old Phokaea north of the Gulf of Izmir, and New Phokaea, built on the coast at the foot of the alum mountains. New Phokaea was established by the Genoese because of Turkish raiding. Dukas, (Bonn), p.161, 5 - p.162, 15; (Bucharest), p.205, 26 - p.207, 18.

<sup>6</sup> Balard, 'The Genoese in the Aegean (1204-1566)' in *Mediterranean Historical Review*, vol.4 (June, 1989), p.161, says the date was undoubtedly 1267. The same date is given in Marino Sanudo. Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.31, gives it as 1275, as does Pachymeres, I, p.419, 10. Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.770-771, basing himself on two notary deeds, says the date must be pre 1268. Liagre, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.179, dates it to 1264.

VIII to Benedetto Zaccaria and his brother Manuel<sup>1</sup>. The Zaccaria family control ended in 1314 with the death of Nicolino and they were succeeded in Phokaea by the Cattaneo della Volta family. Phokaea reverted to Byzantine control in 1336<sup>2</sup> but from 1346 the Maona of Chios assumed control there and the area remained in Genoese hands until 1445. Under the Maona of Chios the alum mines of Phokaea were farmed out, the mines being auctioned approximately every ten years<sup>3</sup>.

In c.1307-8 Muntaneer describes Phokaea as a town of 3,000 Greeks busy in the production of alum<sup>4</sup>. There was clearly a high level of production from Phokaea which, according to Pegolotti, amounted to 14,000 Genoese *kantars* per annum<sup>5</sup>. In the first half of the fifteenth century it was the main alum mine in Anatolia producing a yearly total of 750 tons<sup>6</sup>. According to a Genoese notary deed of 1452 the mines of Phokaea produced c.15,800 *kantars* per annum<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dukas, (Bonn), p.161, 12-15; (Bucharest), p.205, 24-26; Pachymeres, I, p.420, 5-6.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.778; Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.31, makes the date 1340.

<sup>3</sup> Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.32.

<sup>4</sup> Muntaneer, p.156.

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>6</sup> Faroghi, 'Alum production', p.161.

<sup>7</sup> 1452.x.14 = Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', pp.36-37. Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.773, 775, has questioned the accuracy of Pegolotti's production figures, pointing out that Pegolotti gives exactly the same figure for Karahisar alum. In this context the figure from Bernardo de Ferrari is particularly interesting in that it is close to that of Pegolotti. But Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.37 note 20, points out that this was the minimum. Draperio refers to fraud of 6%, so that without fraud this figure would be

Phokaea alum was used to make a mixture of 2/5th rock and 3/5th *allume corda* and was very similar to second quality alum (*allume di sorte della buona luminiera*)<sup>1</sup>. It was traded locally and exported to the west. It sold in Constantinople, Pera<sup>2</sup>, Chios<sup>3</sup>, Bruges<sup>4</sup>, Middelburg<sup>5</sup> and Ecluse<sup>6</sup>. The importance of Phokaea alum is clear from Dukas, according to whom every ship in the early fifteenth century sailing westwards from there carried a cargo of alum. Phokaea alum was, according to Dukas, used by French, German, English, Italian, Spanish, Arab, Egyptian and Syrian dyemakers<sup>7</sup>.

Alum mines in Phokaea were, at least on occasion, owned

---

17,300 kantars per annum.

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.43.

<sup>3</sup> 1405.iv.4 = Doehaerd-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, nos. 11, 12, pp.13-17, sale of 3,000 kantars of grain alum of Phokaea in Chios; 1413.xii.18 = *ibid*, no. 167, pp.159-160, 10,000 kantars of alum being loaded in New Phokaea and Chios; 1426.v.26 = *ibid*, no.305, pp.338-339, alum loaded in Phokaea, some of which was off-loaded in Chios.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.244; Doehaerd-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, no.261, pp.289-291, 2,126 kantars of grain alum of Phokaea were in Bruges.

<sup>5</sup> 1388.viii.18 or 28 = Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, no.526, pp.691-695. 3,000 kantars were loaded in New Phokaea and 490 kantars in Old Phokaea for Middelburg. This document gives the loading times for the alum as eight days in New Phokaea and four days in Old Phokaea; 1439.xi.9 = Doehaerd-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, no.805, pp.630-633, 11 000 kantars or more of Phokaea alum was to be shipped to Ecluse or Middelburg.

<sup>6</sup> 1426.v.26 = Doehaerd-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, no. 305, pp.338-339, 9,000 kantars of alum from Phokaea were shipped to Ecluse. 1439.xi.9 = *ibid*, no.805, pp.630-633, 11,000 kantars of Phokaea alum were to be shipped to Ecluse or Middelburg.

<sup>7</sup> Dukas, (Bonn), p.161, 9-12; (Bucharest), p.205, 21-23.



or leased by the *appaltatores*, officials appointed by the Chian government to collect the tax on alum there. It seems that their ability to lease them out was controlled by the authorities on Chios for in 1394 Francesco de Campis, the ex-*apaltator* of Phokaea, was granted permission from Chios to lease to Nicolao Paterio, one of the current *apaltatores*, an alum works which he owned in Phokaea, for the period in which Nicolao held office. In return, Nicolao was to pay 400 gold ducats, or 350 *kantars* of rock alum if Francesco preferred, as surety, the ducats or alum being returnable when Nicolao handed back the alum works to Francesco at the end of his period in office. Presumably, Francesco would have used the money or alum for trading during the period in which the mine was let. Whether he chose alum or cash presumably depended on how easily he could dispose of the alum and on how much money he was likely to make on it. As he owned an alum mine and had been an *appaltator* in Phokaea, he could be presumed to have been active in the alum trade.

Alum could also be used in place of cash for purchasing an alum mine, for if Francesco wished to sell his alum works to Nicolao, Nicolao was bound to buy it for 300 *kantars* of rock alum, Francesco returning the 400 ducats given him by Nicolao when Francesco originally handed the works over to him<sup>1</sup>. Nicolao Paterio also bought another alum mine in Phokaea in the same year for 400 gold ducats<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1394.ii.18 = ASG, Not. Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filza 1, doc.97/240.

<sup>2</sup> 1394.iii.19 = Argenti, Chios, I, p.488.

Other sources of alum included that of the Black Sea region at Karahisar (Koloneia)<sup>1</sup>. The Genoese were exporting alum from there before c.1275<sup>2</sup> and presumably controlled the trade of Karahisar alum to Europe throughout the fourteenth century, when they were the dominant force in the Black Sea<sup>3</sup>. These activities clashed with the interests of the Zaccaria of Phokaea who, in order to protect their own alum monopoly, sought to have an interdict applied against the alum of Karahisar to prevent its export to the west. In 1275 they obtained an agreement to this effect from Michael VIII. But the Genoese government was not happy and the interdict was quashed<sup>4</sup>.

Karahisar alum was the best type of alum produced in Turchia. There were three grades: rock alum which was the most valuable; second quality alum (*allume di sorta della buona allumiera*), made up of 2/5th rock and 3/5th *allume corda*, a grain alum (*allume minuto*); and *allume corda*, which was the most grainy type of alum<sup>5</sup>. Annual production was 14,000 Genoese *kantars*<sup>6</sup>. It was exported from Giresun (Kerasunt, Chisenda), a seven day journey from Karahisar<sup>7</sup> and

---

<sup>1</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.168, note 709.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.773, says it was pre March 1274.

<sup>3</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.167.

<sup>4</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.776-777.

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>6</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>7</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

was sold in Constantinople and Pera<sup>1</sup> and in markets further west for Karahisar alum appears in the accounts of Bruges for 1312, valued at 40 *denari*<sup>2</sup>.

Another source of alum was Kütahya. Pegolotti gives information on Kütahya alum (*allume dal cotai e d'Altoluogo*) which he says was close to Phokaea alum in quality and sold in Constantinople and Pera<sup>3</sup>. It was "grossetto" and "minuto" mixed together, similar to Ulubad (Ulek Abad) alum but more grainy (*minuto*). 12,000 Genoese *kantars* per annum were produced and alum was exported through Theologos (Altoluogo) and Balat (Palatia) with 4,000 *kantars* going out through Antalya<sup>4</sup>. According to Professor Balard<sup>5</sup>, the alum referred to as alum of Christo is the same as Kütahya alum, as is the alum noted by William of Rubruck towards the mid thirteenth century as coming from mines in the Sultanate of Iconium<sup>6</sup>. Kütahya alum was pledged in Genoa in 1343 as part security for 396 *florins*. It was on a *cocha* due to leave Genoa for Ecluse, calling at Maiorca, Cadiz and Malaga<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.43.

<sup>2</sup> Liagre, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.187 and note 65.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.43.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.369. Pegolotti does not specify how often the 4,000 *kantars* went to Antalya but it may well have been a per annum figure as are his production figures.

<sup>5</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.773, note 21.

<sup>6</sup> William of Rubruck, p.273; MS 66A, ff.109r col.1 -109v col 1; MS 181, f.396. But see Heyd, *Histoire du commerce*, II, p.567.

<sup>7</sup> 1343.iv.10 = Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, doc.12, pp.155-158.

Mention is made in Genoese notary deeds of alum of Scorpiata. Scholars are divided as to whether this could be taken as evidence that the alum originated from Scorpiata or that simply it was exported from there. According to Professor Balard, the Genoese began to go to Scorpiata for alum from 1380<sup>1</sup>. He questions whether this alum represented local production from mines previously unknown or whether the alum was in fact from mines close to the Sea of Marmara, at Ulubad (Ulek Abad, Greek Lopadion) and Kapı Dağ (Cyzicus), which the Genoese had brought overland to avoid a passage through the straits. Professor Balard concludes that the alum was probably from local mines, pointing out that if the Genoese had wished to avoid a passage through the straits and were using Scorpiata solely as a place from which to collect alum, they would surely have been more likely to have selected Edremit (Adramytion), altogether more accessible than Scorpiata<sup>2</sup>.

In support of this one could argue that Scorpiata clearly had drawbacks as a loading site, being a beach not a port<sup>3</sup> and therefore loading and unloading would have been

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.774. Balard does not give his reasons for this dating. If it is based on lack of documents referring to Scorpiata prior to 1380, surely this could simply be fortuitous, no documents happening to have survived. It seems to me unlikely that one could in fact be so precise over the dating here.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II. p.774.

<sup>3</sup> 1408.x.24 = ASG, Notario Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filza 1, doc.7386. The captain in this deed said that he was unable at that moment to collect alum from Scorpiata because the weather/season was such that he could not go to Scorpiata, it being a beach. It was contested that the alum left in Scorpiata was in danger of deterioration and "other

hampered both by location and by weather conditions. In 1393 Scorpiata is specifically excluded in an agreement over loading goods including alum in a port in Turchia. Manuel de Auria promised to go with his ship to Chios and to wait there for two days to be told by the hirer, Michaelae Lomelino, which port in Turchia, including Mytilene, he was to go to. Manuel stated however that he was not held to go to Scorpiata, even if told to do so. The document gives no indication as to why Manuel was not prepared to go to Scorpiata but it may well have been that his refusal was in some way connected with difficulties of loading or landing there<sup>1</sup>. That Scorpiata was not ideal is confirmed by a notary deed of 1404 in which a captain of a ship agrees to go to Scorpiata or another place nearby better suited to loading<sup>2</sup>.

While one can convincingly argue that Scorpiata had its

---

things" (although it was also contested that the alum was safe and well looked after), perhaps further indicating Scorpiata's difficulties as a loading place - 1408.x.13 = *ibid*, doc.397.

<sup>1</sup> 1393.vi.28 = Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, no.565, pp.746-751. "Ego Manuel de Auria ...promito ...cum ipsa [ie the ship] ire et recto viago navigare Syum et in Syo cum dicta navi stare et expectare diebus duobus continuis proximis venturis postquam dicta navis ibi aplicuerit pro habendo ibi responsionem a te [ie Michaelis Lomelinus] vel ab alio pro te ad quem locum unum tamen Turchie ire debeam pro infrascripto onere levando et onerando, in quibus locis Turchie comprehendatur et comprehendi debeat Metelinus, salvo et acto quod non teneam ire Scorpiatam, etiam si mihi responderetur quod ire deberem Scorpiatam".

<sup>2</sup> 1404.xi.4 = Doehaerd-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, no.10, pp.11-13, "ad La Scorpiata, vel alium locum eidem vicinum magis habile ad levandum et onerandum onus infrascriptum ... in dicto loco Scorpiate vel alio loco eidem vicino magis abili ad levandum".

drawbacks as a loading site, this does not necessarily mean that the alum exported from there was from a previously unknown local source, as Professor Balard has concluded. The name Scorpiata when applied to alum may well refer to Scorpiata as the export port and not the place of origin of this alum. Evidence for such an argument may be adduced from the fact that Pegolotti refers to Kütahya alum variously as "allume dal Cotai e d'Altoluogo", "allume del Cotai, cioè d'Altoluogo", "allume di Coltai d'Altoluogo"<sup>1</sup>. However he explains that the alum of Kütahya was sometimes called alum of other Turkish places or alum of Theologos (Altoluogo) but that its correct name was Kütahya (Coltai) because it came from the area of Kütahya<sup>2</sup>. As Theologos was one of the ports for Kütahya alum<sup>3</sup> perhaps this is why it was sometimes called "allume d'Altoluogo". This may well also explain the name alum of Christo referring to Kütahya alum<sup>4</sup>, where again the name of the export port and not that of the origin is used.

Thus, by the same token, the alum of Scorpiata could have come from somewhere else, such as Kütahya. Against this however is the fact that it would seem strange to take the alum to Scorpiata rather than to the nearer and more accessible and suitable ports of Balat (Palatia) and

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.43, p.293.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>4</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.773, note 21, says that the alum of Christo is without doubt Kütahya alum. Balard identifies Cristo as, in all probability, the port of Dioshieron near Theologos.

Theologos, from which Kütahya alum was in fact exported. More plausibly, the alum of Scorpiata might have originated in the nearby alum producing areas of Ulubad (Ulek Abad) or Kapı Dağ (Cyzicus). Two Genoese notary deeds refer to the alum of Scorpiata as "bad" rock alum ("bruta"), perhaps adding weight to this supposition<sup>1</sup> since Pegolotti describes the alum from Kapı Dağ as "poco e molto laida" (small and foul), one of the three worst sorts<sup>2</sup>.

Professor Balard further argues that the frequent mention of Scorpiata alum between 1384 and 1409 leads one to conclude that there must have been alum producing mines there which came to compete with the mines of Phokaea<sup>3</sup>. This seems too strong a conclusion to make on the evidence available, particularly bearing in mind that the alum of Scorpiata may well have got its name from the port and not the place of origin. The Genoese archival material seems more plentiful for the 1390s than for the earlier period, and this alone could account for the apparent upsurge in material relating to Scorpiata.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1408.x.22 = ASG, Notaio Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filza 1, doc.388, "aluminum de rocha bruta"; 1408.x.24 = ibid, doc.?386, "aluminum bruti".

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>3</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.774. He refers to ASG Not. Cart. 311, ff.154r, 155r; Not. Gregorio Panissario, doc. 118; Not. Giovanni Balbi, 1408.x.13, 17, 22; Liagre de Sturler, docs. 457, 499, 500. But the Balbi documents all refer to the same alum, (and interestingly Balard does not refer to the other documents in this series, 1408.viii.14 and 1408.x.24). Similarly docs. 499 and 500 in Liagre de Sturler both deal with the same cargo of alum. Do these references in fact amount to frequent mention, sufficient to allow Balard to draw his conclusion about the importance of a mine in the Scorpiata area?

Whether there was or was not a new source of alum in the Scorpiata it is certainly clear that alum was sold and exported from there. In 1384 there is a reference to a cargo of alum loaded in Pera or Scorpiata, insured for 125 Genoese pounds, which was to be unloaded in either Ecluse, England or Middelburg<sup>1</sup>, and four years later alum was loaded in Scorpiata for Ecluse<sup>2</sup>. In 1404, 10,000 kantars of alum were to be loaded in Scorpiata for Southampton and La Crussa<sup>3</sup>. In 1408 there was a sale of 4,999 kantars and 50 rotoli of alum - 3,000 kantars of grain alum and 1,999 kantars and 50 rotoli of rock alum - in Scorpiata where the ship was to spend 12 days loading alum and other merchandise<sup>4</sup>. The

---

<sup>1</sup> 1384.x.29 = Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, no.457, pp.606-607.

<sup>2</sup> 1388.i.2 = Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, no.499, pp.654-655; 1388.i.3 = *ibid*, no.500, pp.655-666.

<sup>3</sup> 1404.xi.4 = Doehaerd-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, no.10, pp.11-13. La Crussa = Pegnitz, *Orbis Latinus*, I, p.597.

<sup>4</sup> ASG, Notaio Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filza 1. In the sale document, doc.397, 1408.viii.14, the amount of alum sold is 2,000 to 2,500 kantars of rock alum, whatever the whole amount was, and c. 3,000 kantars of grain alum. In doc. 397, 1408.x.13, the first in a series of documents concerning a dispute over the sale, the amount appears as 5,500 kantars, as it does in doc. 396, 1408.x.17. Doc.388, 1408.x.22, is more precise. It says that the sale was of 5,000 kantars, 3,000 of grain alum and 2,000 or more of rock alum. But it also says that 1,561 cantars and 50 rotols of rock alum were loaded and 3,000 kantars of grain alum and 438 kantars of rock alum were left behind in Scorpiata. These figures are repeated in doc.386, 1408.x.24, although in the second reference to the amount loaded the document misses out the 50 rotols. It also makes the total 5,000 kantars though it must have been 4 999 kantars and 50 rotols. Heers, *l'alun*, p.35, refers to the sale as being of 5,500 kantars of alum with payment in cloth. But, as shown above, the amount must have been 4,999 kantars and 50 rotols and the payment was for half the amount in cloth. There were 100 rotols in one Genoese kantar, Schilbach, *Metrologie*, pp.188, 189.



documents dealing with this sale and the subsequent dispute<sup>1</sup> show that the Florentines too were involved in buying and exporting alum from Scorpiata, since the alum in question was sold by a Genoese, Fillipo Lomelino, to two Florentine merchants, Petro de Ticio and Gieronimo Bartolo, who were to pay half the price of the alum in Florentine cloth. It is interesting to note the large amount of alum bought at Scorpiata in these documents, particularly when compared with Pegolotti's annual production figures for Phokaea and Karahisar of 14,000 *kantars* per annum<sup>2</sup>.

Alum was also produced in various other places in Anatolia. Ulubad (Ulek Abad) alum (*allume lupaio* or *allume lupaio turchesco*) was sold in Constantinople and Pera<sup>3</sup>. It was "allume grossetto", heavier than that of Kütahya and was exported through Trilia (Triglia). The annual production figure was 10,000 Genoese *kantars*<sup>4</sup>. It was clearly traded to Bruges as it appears in a list of alum values there<sup>5</sup>. Camalı also had mines producing excellent rock alum and the Genoese went there<sup>6</sup>. Alum from Kapı Dağ (Cyzicus) (*allume*

---

<sup>1</sup> The series of documents about this sale are 1408.viii.14 = ASG, Notaio Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filza 1, doc.384; 1408.x.13 = *ibid*, doc.397; 1408.x.17 = *ibid*, doc.395; 1408.x.17 = *ibid*, doc.396; 1408.x.22 = *ibid*, doc.388; 1408.x.24 = *ibid*, doc.?386.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.43.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.369.

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, p.243.

<sup>6</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.774 and note 23, citing ASG, Not. Cart. no.445/2.

*Chisico*) was one of the three worst sorts together with *Diaschila alum* (*allume ghiaghillo*) and *allume corda*<sup>1</sup>. It was used for tanning hides and was "small and foul" ("poco e molto laida")<sup>2</sup>. It too is listed among the alums in Bruges<sup>3</sup>.

The export of alum from Anatolia was subject to tax. It would seem from Pegolotti that the tax on alum exported from Theologos was 4%, as he states that, with the exception of wax, all goods paid at this rate<sup>4</sup>. From various treaties with the Venetians it is known that alum in the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın was placed under *appalto*, that is, it was tax farmed<sup>5</sup>. In the treaty of 1337 between Johannes Sanudo, Duca di Candia, and İbrahim, emir of Menteşe, and in the treaty between Sanudo and Hızır of Aydın in the same year, alum is listed as one of the goods on which the Venetians did not have to pay *appalto*. This is presumably a concession specially for the Venetians and therefore one can presume that generally the *appalto* was applied to alum. This point is further strengthened by clause 28 of the treaty where İbrahim stated that he would impose *apalto* on alum in Balat (Palatia) if Hızır of Aydın concluded a treaty with Crete but

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.43, 293, 369.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.369. Pegolotti says that many alums were called "cassico" because of their smallness and foulness.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.243.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.56.

<sup>5</sup> See Chapter II.

continued to make alum subject to *apalto* in Aydın<sup>1</sup>.

It would appear that at some time between 1337 and 1358 *apalto* was imposed on alum in Menteşe since Musa, emir of Menteşe, undertook in his treaty of 1358 with the Duca di Candia, Pietro Badoer, to lift *apalto* on alum<sup>2</sup>.

In the treaty of 1375 between Ahmed, emir of Menteşe, and Giovanni Gradenigo, Duca di Candia, the clause of the 1337 treaty relating to non-payment of *apalto* for alum is repeated. However the 1375 treaty is largely a word for word copy of the 1337 treaty, of which it was a renewal. In some clauses, for example 26 and 27 where the oaths of İbrahim and his nobles are copied exactly, the content is clearly completely out of date, and this therefore casts doubt on the reliability of the other clauses. One has to wonder whether they were merely mindless copying or whether they, or at least some of them, were relevant to conditions in 1375<sup>3</sup>. Under the 1403 treaty between İlyas, emir of Menteşe and the Duca di Candia, Marco Falier, there was to be no *datium* imposed on alum<sup>4</sup>. The 1407 treaty, this time between İlyas, emir of Menteşe, and the new Duca di Candia, Leonardo Bembo, refers to no *amalim* being imposed on alum, meaning that, for

---

<sup>1</sup> 1337.pre iv = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198, clause 28, pp.199-200; 1337.iii.6 = *ibid*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192.

<sup>2</sup> 1358.x.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, clause 8, p.218.

<sup>3</sup> 1375.iv.22 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1375M, pp.222-223.

<sup>4</sup> 1403.vii.24 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1403M DVL, clause 22, p.231. Doc.1403M has "gabelam" in place of "datium", clause 22, p.231.

the Venetians, it was not subject to *appalto*<sup>1</sup>.

*Gabellas* and *introytus* were charged on alum in Phokaea, which taxes were collected by the *apaltatores*. It appears that, at least for the end of the fifteenth century, the *apaltatores* were entitled to some tax concessions on alum which they acquired during their period in office as they were able to export it without paying any "new taxes" on it<sup>2</sup>.

It seems that under the Ottomans alum was farmed out to the Genoese. Dukas, for example, refers to Giovanni Adorno, the new Podestà of Phokaea, who, in c.1415<sup>3</sup>, "according to ancient custom" , went to present himself to Mehmed I and made the "customary obeisance". In return for the rights to farm alum, which he "finally" obtained from the Sultan, he had to pay 20,000 gold coins per annum for the 10 years of his period in office. On Mehmed's death the money went to his successor, Murad II, Adorno again making obeisance before the Sultan. Adorno had fallen behind on his payments because of the Genoese-Catalan wars which prevented the export of

---

<sup>1</sup> 1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1407M, clause 22, p.236. See section on taxes.

<sup>2</sup> 1394.ii.18 = ASG, Notaio Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filza 1, doc.97/240. The *apaltatores* in question were granted this tax concession because this was an established practice: "Et hec ut supra declaramus [referring to the concession] cum cognoverimus sic temporibus retroactis usitatum fuisse". Francesco, ex-*apaltator*, had however to pay *gabellas* and *introytus* on alum which he had put in Phokaea after he had ceased being *apaltator* unless Domenico Giustiniano, Podestà of Chios, certified that the alum had been sent to Phokaea for a legitimate reason. He had to pay on alum put in Phokaea by him after Nicolao had taken over the *apaltatorship*, as others paid it.

<sup>3</sup> Dukas, (Bonn), p.164, 8; (Bucharest), p.209, 18. Dukas says that this happened six years before the death of Mehmed. Mehmed died in 824/1421.

alum westwards and, apparently, because of the heavy cost of mining the alum. Murad II waived debts on alum in return for a passage across the straits in his fight with the rival claimant to the throne, Mustafa<sup>1</sup>. Heyd states that the Ottomans did very well financially from alum and that the sultan received 100,000 gold ecus per annum from the trade. However he does not cite his sources for this calculation<sup>2</sup>.

Under Mehmed II too the Genoese were tax farmers of alum. In 1452 Francesco Draperio made an arrangement with Paris Giustiniano, Paulo Bocardo and Benedetto Salvaigo. These three merchants gave Francesco 400 pieces of Genoese cloth worth around 5,000 gold *ducats* of Chios (c.7,000 Genoese *ducats*) which he was allowed to take to Edirne, and promised him a further 45,000 Turkish *aspers* (7,000 gold *ducats* of Chios, 9,800 Genoese), paid in Edirne, if he secured the tax farm of the mines of Greece and Turchia from Mehmed II<sup>3</sup>. In 1454 Mehmed II's fleet appeared off Chios

---

<sup>1</sup> Dukas, (Bonn), p.163, 19 - p.165, 24, p.178, 2 - p.179, 9; (Bucharest), p.209, 9 - p.211, 19, p.225, 24 - p.227, 12. According to Dukas, the amount owed was c. 27,000 gold coins. See also Dukas, pp.162-163 where he refers to a treaty made with Saruhan and the annual payment from Phokaea to him of 15,000 *lepta*.

<sup>2</sup> Heyd, *Histoire du commerce*, II, p.570.

<sup>3</sup> 1452.x (?).28 = Argenti, *Chios*, III, no.222, pp.658-659; Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.50, note 64, dates this document to 1451.xii.28. She refers to the price of alum as fixed at 0.45 of a *ducat* which represented 26,000 *kantars* of alum. However no figure is given in the document. At the same time, without knowing what sort of alum was involved it would be difficult to be precise about what the money paid by Paris and his partners represented in terms of alum. All one can say is that the three Genoese merchants involved considered an investment of 12,000 gold *ducats* of Chios (16,800 Genoese *ducats* - 140 Genoese *ducats* to 100 Chian *ducats*, Heers, *ibid*, p.40, note 39) worthwhile in order to

with instructions that if 40,000 gold coins owed by the Chian authorities for alum to Francesco Draperio (who in turn appears to have owed this sum to the Sultan) was not paid, the island was to be attacked<sup>1</sup>.

It is very difficult to give an accurate and detailed picture of the price of alum in this period. Apart from the usual problem over currency exchange ratios and the correspondence between different measurements, there is the added problem of not always knowing what sort of alum is involved when a price is given. Although on occasions the sources specify, for example, rock alum, often they give a price for unspecified alum only. This problem is compounded by the fact that alums from different regions varied in price<sup>2</sup>.

ALUM PRICES					
DATE	PLACE	TYPE	PRICE IN SOURCE	PRICE IN <u>DUCATS</u>	SOURCE
1323	Pisa	rock	1 <u>soldo</u> per <u>centinaio</u>	1 <u>ducat</u> = 16.5 <u>kantars</u>	Pegolotti, p.208

---

gain control of the alum coming from the mines of the Turkish Sultan. It would be very helpful to know how long Francesco's arrangement with the Sultan was made for. Unfortunately the document gives no indication of this.

<sup>1</sup> Dukas, (Bonn), p.322, 10-19, p.327, 20-22; (Bucharest), p.402, 12-19, p.411, 19-20.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, pp.243-244. In a list of alum values in Bruges the various alums are said to be two *soldi* of the silver *tornesi grossi* cheaper or more expensive than each other. Unfortunately part of the text is missing and so no actual price is given. The alums listed are Cyzicus alum, Ulubad (Ulek Abad) alum, second quality alum, Phokaea alum and rock alum.

1336	Crete		8 <u>hyperpyra</u> per 1 <u>migliaio grosso</u>	1 <u>ducat</u> = 5.5 <u>kantars</u>	1336.x.20 = Zucchello, no.1, p.8
1384			4 <u>hyperpyra</u> per 1 <u>kantar</u>	1 <u>ducat</u> = 0.5 <u>kantars</u>	DVL, II, p.194
1394	Phokaea		40 gold <u>ducats</u> = 100 <u>kantars</u>	4 <u>ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantars</u>	1394.ii.18 = ASG, Notaio Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filza 1, doc.97/240
1394	Phokaea	rock	400 <u>ducats</u> = 350 <u>kantars</u>	1.14 <u>ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1394.ii.18 = ASG, Notaio Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filza 1, doc.97/240
1405	Chios/ Phokaea Mytilene	grain	3,000 gold <u>ducats</u> = 4,000 <u>kantars</u>	0.75 <u>ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1405.iv.4 = Doehaerd and Kerremans, <u>Relations</u> <u>commerciales.</u> no.11, p.12. The alum involved was 3,000 <u>kantars</u> of grain alum of Phokaea and 1,000 <u>kantars</u> of grain alum of Mitylene, the <u>kantars</u> being those of Chios
1408	Pera/ Scorpiat a	rock	2 <u>hyperpyra</u> 12. <u>karati</u> = 1 Genoese <u>kantar</u>	c.0.66 <u>ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1408.viii.14 = ASG, Notaio Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filza 1, doc.384.

1408	Pera/ Scorpiat a	grain	1 <u>hyperpyra</u> 9 <u>karati</u> = 1 Genoese <u>kantar</u>	c.033 <u>ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	ibid
1412				0.7 <u>ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1414.v.29 = Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.39
1438	C'ple	<u>lume de</u> <u>sorta</u>	4 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1.3 <u>ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1438.i.22 = Badoer, <u>Libro</u> , c.261, p.524 (going to Maiorca)
1438	"	rock	7 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	2.3 <u>ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	ibid
1438	"		22 <u>hyperpyra</u> 12 <u>karati</u> = 6 <u>kantars</u>	1.25 <u>ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantars</u>	1438.ii.26 = ibid, c.410, p.822, c.320, p.643 (going to Venice)
1438	"	<u>lume neta</u>	4,5 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1.5 <u>ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1438.iii.5 = ibid, c.194, p.390, c.186, p.375
1438	"		3 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1 <u>ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1438.iv.13 = ibid, c.320, p.642, c.316, p.635 (going to Candia)
1438	"	rock	7 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	2.3 <u>ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1438.vii.26 = ibid, c.220, p.442
1439	"		22 <u>hyperpyra</u> 12 <u>karati</u> = 6 <u>kantars</u>	1.25 <u>ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1439.ii.26 = ibid, c.410, p.822, c.320, p.641 (going to Venice)



1439	"	<u>lume neta</u> (?lume de sorta)	3 <u>hyperpyra</u> 21 <u>karati</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	<u>1.25 ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1439.iii.30 = ibid, c.322, p.646, c.319, p.641
1439	"	<u>lume de</u> <u>sorta</u>	4 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	<u>1.33 ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1439.vii.9 = ibid, c.322, p.646, c.341, p.685
1439	"		5 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 kantar	<u>1.7 ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1439.xi.2 = ibid, c.322, p.646, c.371, p.747
1439	"		4 <u>hyperpyra</u> 18 <u>karati</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	<u>1.6 ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1439.ix.28 = ibid, c.322, p.646, c.284, p.571
1439	"		4 <u>hyperpyra</u> 6 <u>karati</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	<u>1.4 ducats</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1439.ix.28 = ibid, c.322, p.646, c.127, p.257
1448				<u>0.375 ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1449.i.21 = Heers, 'Commerce de l'alun', p.39
1449				more than 0.5 <u>ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1449.iv.28 = ibid
1450				more than 0.5 <u>ducat</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1450.ii.18 = no.174, ibid
1450				45 <u>ducats</u>	1451.xii.28 = ibid

As Professor Zachariadou has pointed out, there appears to have been a considerable increase in alum prices in the eastern Mediterranean during the fourteenth century. In 1336, 5.5 *kantars* of alum was sold for 1 *ducat*. At the end

of the fourteenth century alum fetched in the region of 0.5 of a *ducat* per *kantar*. It seems that this increase took place at the end of the century rather than being a progressive development, something reflected in the Genoese slave market where prices remained without fluctuation throughout the century, increasing only at the end<sup>1</sup>. Both E A Zachariadou and M Balard have attributed this increase to Ottoman activity, Professor Zachariadou ascribing it to Ottoman policy and Professor Balard to Ottoman advance at the end of the century<sup>2</sup>. While it is true that Ottoman advance was no doubt a disruptive factor, it is not likely to have been the sole reason for an increase in price, for, had it

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.780-781. Liagre-de Sturler, *Relations commerciales*, p.CXL also considers the prices stable. Balard, *ibid*, p.781, note 57, in quoting prices for alum at the end of the fourteenth century, refers to ASG, Not Donato di Chiavari, 1394, n.240; Not Gregorio Panissario doc.70, 135 (date = 1405.18.4, in Doehard-Kerremans, *Relations commerciales*, no.11); D Gioffre, *Atti Rogati in Chio*, 324, 359. Balard here refers to grain alum. But Donato di Chiavari 1394 doc. 240 (1394.ii.18) refers either to alum or rock alum, not to grain alum. As Balard specifically states that the rock alum price is for 1398 (ie not from Donato de Clavaro, of 1394) while he quotes the rest, at the end of the fourteenth century, as grain prices (ie thus including the Donato de Clavaro reference), Balard must here be mistaken, quoting a rock alum price as a grain alum price. Further the prices Balard quotes, grain alum from between 12 sous 6 deniers (ie 0.5 of a *ducat*) and 18 sous 9 deniers ( 0.75 of a *ducat*) per *kantar*, rock alum at 45 sous (1.72 *ducats*) in 1398, do not tie in with the price in Donato de Clavaro, 1394, where the price for alum, type unspecified, was 4-5 gold *ducats* per *kantar* (and so presumably, judging from the price, rock alum). The other alum referred to was rock alum.

<sup>2</sup> According to Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.169, the increase in the price of alum during the fourteenth century was a direct result of Ottoman policy. Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.718, regards the "temporary rise" in alum prices at the end of the fourteenth century as caused by the Ottoman advance.

been, one would perhaps have expected to see a decrease in price after the collapse of the Ottoman state in 1402. In fact however, prices appear to have remained fairly stable, even rising slightly.

A combination of Ottoman advance and subsequent Ottoman policy probably largely explains the increase in alum prices in Anatolia at the end of the fourteenth century. In 1381 the Ottomans took the alum-producing region of Kütahya and, at the beginning of the 1390s, annexed Menteşe and Aydın and thus gained control of the export ports of Theologos and Balat. The Ottomans were thus in a position to control alum exports and prices. The fact that prices apparently did not rise earlier in the century suggests that the beyliks were insufficiently powerful to increase substantially the prices paid by western merchants for alum in their territories. The change once the Ottomans took over suggests a more dynamic economic policy, necessarily supported by considerably greater military strength.

The Ottomans, having taken over areas, did seek to control the alum trade. After taking over Kütahya in 1381, Murad imposed restrictions on alum export, as is indicated by the Venetian Senate's instructions to its ambassador in 1384 to try and ensure that Venetians could load and export rock alum in Murad's territories. At the same time the ambassador was to request a reduction in the price of alum fixed by the sultan<sup>1</sup>. A Genoese notary deed from this period makes it

---

<sup>1</sup> 1384.vii.22 = DVL, II, no.116, p.194.

clear that trading alum in Turchia was then not always easy<sup>1</sup>. The document refers to the goods of the late Nicolao de Oliva, the executor of whose will, Giovanni de Bulgaro, had been unable to carry out his functions as *fideicommissor* because of "various impediments and the great diversity of his trade". He had particular difficulty in Pera and Turchia because of the distances involved, the dangers and the abundance of his goods<sup>2</sup>. Giovanni in consequence appointed two agents to deal with all Nicolao's affairs and to receive all the alum that Giovanni Demorode had in Turkey and that from the goods of the late Nicolao and to sell it, investing or lending the money from the sale<sup>3</sup>.

According to Dr Zhukov,<sup>the</sup> Ottoman take over of Kütahya in 1381 resulted in an almost complete paralyzation of the alum trade in Menteşe and Aydın, forcing the Genoese to obtain alum from areas under Ottoman control, in particular, in the period 1384-1409, from Scorpiata. This discontinuance of the transit trade, again according to Dr Zhukov, deprived the emirs of Aydın and Menteşe of an important source of foreign

---

<sup>1</sup> 1381.ii.28 = ASG, Notaio Cart. 175, ff.114r-115r.

<sup>2</sup> "impeditus variis et pluribus diversiis suis negociis superesse non potest et maxime partibus Peyre et Turchie in quibus dicuntur esse certa bona dicti condam Nicolai ad quas comode adesse non potest propter distantiam loci, periculo rerum et facultatem suarum omni jure via modo et forma quibus melius potuit et potest."

<sup>3</sup> "ad accipiendum omnem quantitatem aluminum existentium penes Johanem Demorode in Turchia tamquam de bonis dicti condam Nicolai recipienta ipsaque alumina vendendum, alienandum et quitandum de omni precio quod habuerit ex dictis aluminibus processuro, mittendum, cambiandum, risicandum, implicandum pro ut eisdem melius viderit et placuerit."

currency which in turn resulted in the intensification of the unequal balance of trade with the Latin states of the Levant<sup>1</sup>. There are however various factors which argue against this assessment of the situation after 1381. First it relies partly on the assumption that Scorpiata became a centre of either alum trade or production after 1384 and, as has been argued above, this does not seem necessarily established. Further, there was clearly still an alum trade with western merchants in the beyliks during the 1380s and 1390s, apart from the trade in other commodities which is known to have existed. While it seems fairly clear that Ottoman control resulted in a tougher trade policy, as is evidenced by the Venetian senate's request to Murad for a reduction in alum prices and its concern over its citizen's ability to load and export this commodity, trade relations were very much in Ottoman interests and continued under them. It does not seem possible therefore to refer to a paralysis in transit trade, nor to ascribe this as a cause for any worsening balance of trade between western states and the beyliks.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the price of alum was slightly higher, per *kantar* prices ranging from 0.75 of a *ducat* in 1405, c.0.66 for rock and c.0.33 for grain in 1408 and 0.7 in 1412. The price appears to have risen again by the late 1430s, though not by much, for per *kantar* prices in Constantinople then varied between c. 1.25 *ducats* and c. 1.7. By 1450, however, prices appear to have declined again,

---

<sup>1</sup> Zhukov, *Эгейские Эмираты*, p.100.

hitting a level similar to that of the 1390s. In 1448 one *kantar* sold for 0.375 of a *ducat*, and more than 0.5 in 1449 and 1450. After 1453 eastern alum became uncommon in European markets and the price correspondingly increased five fold<sup>1</sup>. By 1462 the Ottoman empire was receiving as much as 300,000 gold *ducats* per annum from alum sales to the West<sup>2</sup>.

The trade in alum sheds light on Ottoman trade policy in various ways. The rise in alum prices at the end of the century and the apparent restrictions imposed by Murad on Venetian trade in alum indicate that the Ottomans pursued a more hard-edged trade policy than that of the weaker beyliks, using their increasing political strength as a base from which to exercise greater economic dominance. Ottoman rulers were prepared to use western merchants, farming out their alum resources particularly to the Genoese, thus benefitting from a guaranteed income without much effort while also receiving the alum they required themselves from their Genoese tax farmers<sup>3</sup>. The Ottomans, as well as exerting control, were also prepared to give concessions in order to foster trade. They did not apparently in general impose restrictions on alum export<sup>4</sup> and allowed some ports to be free. In 1408 Scorpiata appears to have been a free port

---

<sup>1</sup> Delumeau, 'L'alun', p.19; Heers, 'l'alun', p.53.

<sup>2</sup> Laigre 'commerce de l'alun', p.194, citing Pius II *Commentarii rerum memorabilium quae temporibus suis contingerunt* (Rome, 1584) 34041.

<sup>3</sup> There is a reference to Turks buying alum, 1452.x.14 = Heers, 'l'alun', no.187.

<sup>4</sup> Faroghi 'Alum production', p.153. She in fact says that the Ottomans never forbade alum export.

since a sale of alum there is described as being free from all expenses and *anaris* according to the custom of Scorpiata<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1408.viii.14 = ASG, Notaio Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filza 1, doc.384: "libera et expedita ab omnibus expensis et *anaris* secundum consuetudinem loci predicti Schorpiate".

#### SECTION 4: CLOTH

Cloth was an important commodity and figured heavily in trade and in other transactions. Rich fabrics were much valued and given as presents, as bribes and as rewards for favours. The Genoese often made presents of fabrics to the Ottoman ruler and European cloth appears in lists of expenses of the Genoese Comune for their embassies to the Ottomans or for embassies received from the Ottoman ruler. In 1390 cloth was to be given to "Jalabi" (Çelebi, Bayezid I), costing seven *hyperpyra*<sup>1</sup>, in 1391 seven pieces of Florentine cloth were given to Bayezid's ambassador, Serefedinus (Şerefeddin), at a cost of 19 *hyperpyra*, six *karati*<sup>2</sup>, and in the following year seven pieces of "panni rosee" costing 21 *hyperpyra* were given to "Momico turco domini Jhalabi Capitaneo Grecie" , meaning the beylerbeyi of Rumeli and in consequence an extremely important government official. It is significant of the importance which the Ottomans attached to their relations with the Genoese that the beylerbeyi of Rumeli took part in an embassy<sup>3</sup>. In 1392 on two separate occasions, seven pieces of Florentine cloth were given to envoys of Bayezid, once to Bagadus and once to Tangriberinis de Viso, at a cost 21 *hyperpyra*<sup>4</sup>. In that same year, an envoy of Bayezid, who brought news of the King of

---

<sup>1</sup> 1390.iii.31 = ASG, San Giorgio 34 n.590/1304, f.25v.

<sup>2</sup> 1391.xii.19 = ASG, Antico Commune 22, ff.70, 192.

<sup>3</sup> 1392.1.16 = ASG, Antico Commune 22, ff.74, 193.

<sup>4</sup> 1392.ii.24 = ASG, Antico Commune 22, ff.76, 193; 1392.v.23 = *ibid*, ff.78, 196.



Hungary, was given seven pieces of cloth, at a cost to the Comune of 17 *hyperpyra*, 12 *karati*<sup>1</sup>. It is interesting that of these six examples of cloth being presented to a representative of the Ottoman ruler, five were gifts of seven pieces of cloth, while the remaining example is for an unspecified amount. If this is not merely an irrelevant coincidence, it must indicate either that, for some reason, seven was considered a suitable number of pieces for gifts on this type of occasion, or that seven pieces represented a certain measurement, such as a bundle.

Apart from presenting cloth to visiting Ottoman ambassadors, the Genoese Comune spent money on cloth for garments for their own officials sent on embassies to the Ottoman court. In 1392 the Comune paid 18 *hyperpyra*, 10 *karati* for six pieces of "panni rosee pro una veste"<sup>2</sup>. One of the expenses of an embassy of Stephanus Rex sent to Bayezid was for "una veste panni"<sup>3</sup>. Thirty six *hyperpyra*, three *karati* were spent on 13 pieces of "panni virgili florentie pro vestibus duabus" for an embassy to Bayezid<sup>4</sup>. In the same year an expense of an embassy to Bayezid was for six pieces of "panni rosee pro veste una", at a cost of 16 *hyperpyra*, nine *karati*<sup>5</sup>. Six pieces of "panni rosee de grana

---

<sup>1</sup> 1392.x.15 = ASG, Antico Comune 22, ff.88, 175.

<sup>2</sup> 1392.vi.17 = ASG, Antico Comune 22, f.128.

<sup>3</sup> 1392.vi.20 = ASG, Antico Comune 22, ff.81,84.

<sup>4</sup> 1392.v.25 = ASG, Antico Commune 22, f.174; 1392 .v.5 = *ibid*, f.81.

<sup>5</sup> 1392.vi.17 = ASG, Antico Comune 22, ff.84, 92;

pro una veste" for embassy to Bayezid cost the Comune 32 *hyperpyra*, 12 *karati*<sup>1</sup>.

The Turks too used cloth as a suitable gift for visiting dignitaries and on embassies. When the Germiyan ambassador, İshak Fakih, went on an embassy to Murad I, he took with him as a gift (*peşkeş*) Denizli cloth<sup>2</sup>. This was an important embassy as it was for the proposing of a marriage alliance between the daughter of the ruler of Germiyan and Murad I's son Bayezid<sup>3</sup>. In the 1330s Umur Aydınoğlu gave the Arab traveller, ibn Battuta, who travelled in Anatolia in the 1330s and who visited the court of Umur, a parting gift of a piece of gilded silk called "annah"<sup>4</sup> as well two garments of damask, made from silk from Baghdad, Tabris, Nishapur and China<sup>5</sup>. It seems that Turkish cloth was also suitable for horses. Giacomo Badoer covered his horse, which he presented to Antonio Chontarini, with a "coverta turchesca"<sup>6</sup>.

Apart from its use for ceremonial presentation, cloth could be used in other arrangements. It figured in the tribute from Rum given to the Mongols<sup>7</sup> and fabrics formed

---

<sup>1</sup> 1392.vi.17 = ASG, Antico Comune, ff.84, 197.

<sup>2</sup> Aşıkpaşazade (Giese), p.52; (Istanbul), pp.56-7; Neşri, (Menzl Codex), p. 56; (1949), p.204.

<sup>3</sup> Aşıkpaşazade (Giese), p.52; (Istanbul), p.56; Neşri, (Menzl Codex), p.55; (1949), p.204.

<sup>4</sup> Ibn Battuta, p.309.

<sup>5</sup> Ibn Battuta, p.311.

<sup>6</sup> 1439.ii.25 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.380, p.763.

<sup>7</sup> Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p.320, refers to the correspondence of Rashīd al-Dīn in which figure fabrics from Rum or Erzincan.

part of the repayment of a loan from the Ilhanids taken out by `Izz al-Dīn and Rukn al-Dīn and the vizir Şams al-Dīn Baba Tughrâ'ī<sup>1</sup>. Cloth was also involved in dealings between Genoese officials and the Comune of Pera and the Byzantine Emperor when it was given as a reward for services rendered. In 1402 in the enquiry into the conduct of Ettore de Flisto and Ottobono Giustiniano, reference is made to them having received Florentine cloth for a garment for each of them from the Byzantine Emperor in return for their requesting various people to lend the emperor money<sup>2</sup>. In a not dissimilar way, the Ottomans too used cloth as a form of bribe. During the period of struggle between the sons of Bayezid, Mustafa attacked Bursa whereupon the top men there gathered together money and 100 pieces of cloth (*kumaş*) which they sent with Ahi Ya'kub and Ahi Kadem to present to Mustafa's Lala, Şarapdar İlyas. The presents were accepted and a settlement arranged<sup>3</sup>.

Cloth was a major item in trade between Turc<sup>h</sup>ia and the western city states. Expensive fabrics were imported into Anatolia which, in turn, was a producer and exporter both of raw materials and of expensive, worked tissues. Marco Polo referred to the manufacture of beautiful carpets and rich,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p.332.

<sup>2</sup> 1402.v.30 = ASG, San Giorgio 34 n.590/1306, f.102r: "habuisse a dicto domino imperatore certum panum florentie pro una gona pro quolibet ipsorum. Et hoc quia ipsi Hector et socius rogabant diversis personis, tam civibus Janue quam burgensibus Peyre quod ipsi prestarent ipsi domino imperatori aliquam quantitatem peccunie".

<sup>3</sup> Aşıkpaşazade (Giese), p.90; (Istanbul), p.101; Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.152, (1957), p.568.

high-quality silks of various colours and talked of the Armenians of Erzincan making a beautiful buckram<sup>1</sup>. Piloti, referring to the period at the end of the fourteenth century and beginning of the fifteenth century, wrote of carpets exported from Antalya and Alanya and of the Genoese exporting them from Balat<sup>2</sup> Sivas and Kastamonu produced woollen goods in the mid thirteenth century<sup>3</sup>. Denizli, in south west Turkey, produced good quality cloth, white and marked (ie with a sign) used for the kaftan (*sırtak tekele*) worn over a robe of honour<sup>4</sup>. The edging for such robes was made from the red cloth produced in Alaşehir<sup>5</sup>. Cloth was exported from Balat and other places in Turchia in bales<sup>6</sup> while Erzincan buckram was sold in wooden boxes by 10ths of pieces in Pera and Constantinople<sup>7</sup>, and in Pisa<sup>8</sup>. In France, Turkish

---

<sup>1</sup> Marco Polo, ed. Pauthier, II, pp.37-38. This edition refers "draps de soie de diverses couleurs moult beaux et moult riches, en moult grant qualité". Marco Polo (Rugoff), p.50, refers to "silks of crimson and other rich colours". The buckram made in Erzincan was "les meilleurs bouguerans du monde", Marco Polo, ed. Pauthier, II, pp.37-38.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, pp.60, 73.

<sup>3</sup> Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p.320, refering to the *Risâla* of Ibn Kiyâ Mazandarânî.

<sup>4</sup> The Ottoman word is bezler, a linen, hempen or cotton cloth. Aşıkpaşazade (Giese), p.52; (Istanbul), p.56; Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.55; (1949), p.204.

<sup>5</sup> "Alaşehirin kızıl ıvladısından zincef" (Neşri), "Alaşehirin kızıl ıvladısın sancak " (Aşıkpaşazade). Aşıkpaşazade (Giese), p.52; (Istanbul), p.56; Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.55; (1949), p.204.

<sup>6</sup> Piloti, pp.61-62: "couvertures par balles ... fautes de laine".

<sup>7</sup> Pegolotti, p.36.

<sup>8</sup> Pegolotti, p.208.

camelot cloth became so widespread that by the end of the Middle Ages even the poorer element of society was clothed in it<sup>1</sup>. Anatolia also exported covers for horses. In 1438 the merchant Giacomo Badoer imported into Constantinople from Bursa a cover for his horse costing 60 aspers (5.7 *hyperpyra*)<sup>2</sup>. This may perhaps be the same as the "coverta turchesca" on his horse when he presented it to Antonio Chontarini a few months later<sup>3</sup>.

Western merchants came to the Near East to buy raw silk for the developing European silk industry, an industry in which Genoa played a dominant role<sup>4</sup>. After the Black Death, the much reduced population turned increasingly to luxuries, one of the manifestations of which was the wearing of silk garments. In England the silk industry grew constantly throughout the fourteenth and first part of the fifteenth centuries<sup>5</sup>. Presumably this upsurge in the wearing of silk increased the demand for the raw material and thus boosted the silk markets of Turchia, predominantly that of Bursa, the Turkish centre of the trade. At the same time, however, while the European silk industry continued to develop after

---

<sup>1</sup> Lopez, Miskimin, Udovitch, 'England to Egypt, 1350-1500', p.105, citing Francisque-Michel, *Recherches sur le commerce, la fabrication, et l'usage des étoffes de soie*, 2 vols, (Paris, 1852-4), vol II, p.46.

<sup>2</sup> 1438.xii.28 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.301, p.604.

<sup>3</sup> 1439.ii.25 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.380, p.763. The exchange rate is given as 10.5 aspers to one *hyperpyron*

<sup>4</sup> Lopez, Miskimin, Udovitch, 'England to Egypt, 1350-1500', p.114.

<sup>5</sup> Lopez, Miskimin, Udovitch, 'England to Egypt, 1350-1500', pp.99-100, 104-105.

the Black Death, the main Italian centre, Lucca, which had by the thirteenth century a well established silk industry<sup>1</sup>, never recovered its former strength after the Black Death<sup>2</sup>.

Silk was much traded in Turchia by western merchants who exported it from ports such as Antalya and Alanya, from where it was shipped to Constantinople and Alexandria<sup>3</sup>, and frequented Bursa, a major silk emporium to which came the raw silks of Astarabad and Gilan which were then exported westward, to Venice and to Lucca, the centre of the European silk industry in the fourteenth century. Schiltberger refers to silk from "Schurban" being worked in Damascus, Caffa and Bursa, thus possibly implying that the silk trade and silk industry of Bursa were comparable to those of these other two cities<sup>4</sup>. Turchia exported both Iranian silk brought into the country and traded with western merchants in Turkish markets, particularly Bursa, and Turkish silk known as *seta turci*<sup>5</sup>. Turkish silk was sold in Pisa<sup>6</sup> and appears in Pegolotti in a list headed "Nomora di seta"<sup>7</sup>. It is also noted in a list of "tare di seta"<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ashtor, *Social and Economic History*, p.263.

<sup>2</sup> Lopez, Miskimin, Udovitch, 'England to Egypt, 1350-1500', p.114.

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, pp.60, 63.

<sup>4</sup> Schiltberger, p.34

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, pp.430, 212, 301.

<sup>6</sup> Pegolotti, pp.208-209.

<sup>7</sup> Pegolotti, p.297.

<sup>8</sup> Pegolotti, p.300.

Silk often made up part of the merchandise of Genoese merchants, or those acting as Genoese citizens. In 1402 Ettore de Flisco took in Trabzon two or three *fardellos* of silk which belonged to a dead Armenian who was treated as Genoese. This seems from context to mean that Ettore, as a Genoese representative, laid claim to the silk while he was in Trabzon from Caffa on business of the Comune<sup>1</sup>. Some years later Petro Drago de Sanguines, heir of Batisto Drago, acknowledged in Caffa that he had received all goods and monies of the late Batisto held by Prospero Adorno including a *fardeletus* and two *fardelli* of silk ("cete") held by the agent of Prospero Adorno in Amasra (Samachi), on the Black Sea coast east of Zonguldak<sup>2</sup>.

Turchia was a cotton producing and exporting area, particularly high quality cotton being grown in the Çukurova plain, between Adana and Tarsus, which remained one of the major cotton producing areas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, together with the sancaks of Aydın, Saruhan and Kütahya<sup>3</sup>. Cotton was traded in Antalya (Setalia) where it

---

<sup>1</sup> 1402.v.30 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 n.590/1306. f.102r: "se tractabat pro Januense". The granting of Venetian citizenship to Greek subjects of the Byzantine emperor was a constant bone of contention between Venice and Constantinople. Successive emperors complained of lost tax revenue due to their nationals claiming Venetian nationality, Chrysostomides, 'Commercial Privileges', pp.276-289.

<sup>2</sup> 1410.x.7 = ASG, Giovanni Labaino Sc 40 filze 1, doc.15. In the manuscript the scribe first wrote "turchia" and then crossed it out and wrote "Samachi".

<sup>3</sup> There was also, in this later period, cotton production in Erzincan, Malatya and Alanya. Centres of production of cotton cloth (*bez/ boğası*) in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were the sancaks of Aydın, Hamid and İçel. According to Professor Faroqi, it seems possible that

was sold by the *stadera* (ie the steelyard balance)<sup>1</sup>, and in Bursa where, in the later part of the fifteenth century, Benedetto Dei mentioned its sale to Florentines<sup>2</sup>.

Cotton was exported from Turchia to both southern and northern Europe<sup>3</sup>. Turkish *co<sup>t</sup>on* was exported to France where "cotone turchiescho" is listed among goods in Avignon sold "a charicha di 3 chintare" in August 1392. The value of this cotton was entered as 30 *florins*, while that of the "cotone asciano" was 45 *florins*, of the "cotone damano" 40 *florins* and of the "cotone alessandrino" 36 *florins*<sup>4</sup>. One of the Anatolian export ports for cotton was Foça from where cotton was sent westwards as far as Spain. In the 1430s it was shipped from there to Ancona<sup>5</sup> and Maiorca<sup>6</sup>. The scale of cotton exports from Foça, or perhaps the volume of commodities handled there in general, may be gauged from the problem of over-loading. In 1438 Alesandro Zien was unable to load 49 *kantars* of cotton in Foça, leaving them there with Pantalon

---

in some areas of Anatolia in the sixteenth century commercialized weaving was fairly widespread and aimed not just at local consumption but also for the Istanbul market. There seems in that period to have been a fairly lively trade in cotton thread, Faroghi, 'Production of Cotton', pp.406-407,411,413).

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>2</sup> Dei, p.141.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Lopez, Harry Miskimin, Abraham Udovitch, *England to Egypt, 1350-1500*', p.105.

<sup>4</sup> 1392.viii. = Heers, 'Commercio', pp.162-164.

<sup>5</sup> 1439.vii.28 = Badoer, *libro*, c.320, p.643 (Foie)

<sup>6</sup> 1438.i.22 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.261, p.524. The shipment was of 601 *kantars* 31 *rotols* of cotton of Foça (Foie).



Guardato. Most of the cotton was to be sent on to Ancona the following year<sup>1</sup>. This was presumably because there was no space available for this cotton, indicating in turn that the volume of exports from Foça was greater, on o<sup>ç</sup>as<sub>i</sub>on, than the capacity of the shipping available.

The Venetians invested heavily in the Levantine cotton trade, exporting mostly from Syria but also from Turchia and Grecia<sup>2</sup>. Turkish cotton was imported into Venice from Turchia<sup>3</sup> and from Candia<sup>4</sup>. The Genoese too were very active in the trade of Turkish cotton which was imported into Genoa. The tax owed there in 1377 on 37 sacks of cotton loaded in Balat (Palatia) on the *ligno* of Luchino Cibo valued at £G 942, was 18s. 10d.<sup>5</sup>. It is possible that three bales of cotton thread on a *cocha* en route for Ecluse from Genoa in 1343 were also from Turchia since the bales were listed with 210 *kantars* of alum from Kütahya and Lipari and 158 *kantars* of Turkish alum. Together, the commodities were security for 396 *florins*<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1439.iv.8 = Badoer, *libro*, c.318, p.638, c.224, p.451, c.376, p.754.

<sup>2</sup> Ashtor, 'Underdevelopment', pp.300-301.

<sup>3</sup> 1408.i.17 = Sathas, II, no.460, pp.219-220; 1409.vii.18 = *ibid*, no.472, p.226; 1406.iii.4 = *ibid*, no.364 p.135.

<sup>4</sup> In 1347 ten sacks of Turkish cotton, weighing 1,712 lbs were sent from Candia to Venice, 1347.ix.18 = Zucchello, no.46, p.92; 1347.ix.20 = *ibid*, no.48, p.93; 1347.ix.22 = *ibid*, no.50, p.95; 1347.ix.23 = *ibid*, no.51, p.100.

<sup>5</sup> 1377.viii.9 = Day, *Douanes* II, p.693.

<sup>6</sup> 1343.iv.10 = ASG, notario Tommaso de Casanova, ff.269v-270r.

Other raw material exported from Turchia included unspun hemp which was exported from Theologos<sup>1</sup>, flax, sold in Antalya at the weight of the *stadera* (*steelyard balance*)<sup>2</sup> and Muslin<sup>3</sup>. Wool was exported from Antalya (Sathalia), Alanya (Candeloro), Balat and other places in Turchia<sup>4</sup> and exported to Constantinople and Pera where washed and unwashed Turkish wool was sold<sup>5</sup>. In the 1430s western merchants bought it in the western parts of the Ottoman empire, from Tekirdağ (Rodosto)<sup>6</sup>, Edirne<sup>7</sup> and Gelibolu<sup>8</sup> and the surrounding area, including Megalicharia and Malchara (just north-east of

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.55-57.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>3</sup> 1438.viii.8 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.227, p.456, c.61, p.123, (12 casete of *veli* were sent to Constantinople from Bursa); 1347.i.9 = *ibid*, c.125, p.252, c.160, p.323, (four casete of *veli crespì* were sent from Bursa at 51 *hyperpyra* the caseta).

<sup>4</sup> Piloti, pp.60, 62. Piloti refers to "soye... laine soubtile" from Antalya and Alanya.

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, p.34.

<sup>6</sup> 1438.iii. = Baoder, *Libro*, c.100, p.202, dealing with an expenses incurred on "lana da Rodosto"; 1438.iii.20 = *ibid*, c.197, p.396.

<sup>7</sup> 1438.xii.8 = Baoder, *Libro*, c.292, p.586, c.244, p.491, c.268, p.238, (14 sacks of fine wool ("*lana fina*") of Edirne, weighing 40 *kantars* net, sold in Constantinople for 10 *hyperpyra* per *kantar*); 1437.i.24 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.173, p.348, (refers to ten sacks of wool weighing 21 *kantars* at the weight of Edirne presumably meaning that Edirne, or somewhere in that region, was its place of origin or place of sale).

<sup>8</sup> 1437.iii.13 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.40, p.80, c.306, p.615, refers to buying wool in Gelibolu. 1437.iii.13 = *ibid*, c.41, p.82: "per el viazo di Garipoi per un sacho di lana vergato e j. tamexo chonprò Zorzi" (total = one *hyperpyron* four *karati*); 1437.iii.13 = *ibid*, c.63, p.126, (11 sacks of wool in Gelibolu cost 1,408 aspers).

ispata)<sup>1</sup>, where high quality wool was produced. Bortolamio da Modena bought wool there described as being of the best type ("fo la zima de tuta la sorta"). This wool was later exported to Venice<sup>2</sup> as was part of the 79 sacks of wool, 51 of "lana suzida" and 28 of "lana lavada", bought in Gelibolu by Agustin di Franchi in 1438<sup>3</sup>.

Various expenses were involved in exporting wool from Ottoman territories in the late 1430's, much of which went on carterage and freightage, porters, guides and horses for collection of the wool and boats to transport it to Constantinople, and general living expenses. Money was also paid out for sacks and expenses related to packing the wool. Salaries were another expense. In 1437, 26 *aspers* were given to Bortolamio da Modena, who together with Zorzi Morexini, bought wool in Gelibolu for Giacomo Badoer, for part of the salary Zorzi was to have in Gelibolu. Bortolamio's own salary for the 29 days he spent collecting the wool amounted, at the rate of two *ducats* per month, to four *hyperpyra* while a salary of four *hyperpyra*, 12 *karati* had to be paid for 25 days for a servant to serve in the place of Zorzi<sup>4</sup>. There were also expenses for weighing and customs, and also for bribing the Turkish officials. In 1438, money was listed in Badoer's accounts for a bribe to

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.iii.13 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.63, p.126, c.55, p.111.

<sup>2</sup> 1437.iii.24 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.21, p.42, c.63, p.127.

<sup>3</sup> 1438.ix.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.247, p.496, c.175, p.353; 1439.ii.26 = *ibid*, c.403, p.808.

<sup>4</sup> 1437.viii.17 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.63, p.126, c.88, p.179.

the weighing official and money changers ("per manzaria al pexador e a cholui che zercha l'arzento") of 40 *aspers* (3.8 *hyperpyra*). The total purchase price for the wool was 4,818 *aspers* and thus the bribe represented approximately 0.8% of the purchase price. 105 *aspers* (ten *hyperpyra*) was also set aside to bribe the *subaşı* ("per manzaria al subaşı")<sup>1</sup>. Gifts too were taken apparently as bribes for one of the expenses incurred on the purchase of wool in Tekirdağ was one *hyperpyron* six *karati* "per agi e savon e altre chose, che portono chon lor per donar" which were presumably bribes to officials<sup>2</sup>.

By comparing the prices and expenses given by Badoer for wool sales it is possible to obtain some idea of what percentage of the purchase price the expenses represented. In 1438 a company was formed with a capital of 5,200 Turkish *aspers* (around 483.7 *hyperpyra*) to buy wool in Tekirdağ<sup>3</sup>. Their total expenses on a purchase of 5,200 *asper* (c.483.7 *hyperpyra*) came to 14.75 *hyperpyra*, around 3% of the purchase price<sup>4</sup>. Expenses on wool bought in Edirne in 1437 and sent

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.x.16 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.247, p.469.

<sup>2</sup> 1438.iii.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.197, p.396.

<sup>3</sup> Three thousand Turkish *aspers* worth was bought at the rate of 11 *aspers* "mancho tornexi 5" per *hyperpyon* and a further 2,200 at the rate of 10.75 *aspers* per *hyperpyron*.

<sup>4</sup> 1438.iii.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.197, p.396. The expenses were eight *hyperpyra* for carterage and three horses at one *hyperpyron* per day, five *hyperpyra* 12 *karati* on the freight charge for a boat (*barcha*) to take the wool from Tekirdağ to Constantinople, and one *hyperpyron* six *karati* for gifts, presumably meaning bribes.

to Trabzon<sup>1</sup> were as much as 23%, for on a purchase of ten sacks of wool, weighing 23 *kantars* of Edirne and sold at 40 *aspers* (3.6 *hyperpyra*) per *kantar*, making a total purchase price of 920 *aspers* (82.8 *hyperpyra*), the expenses amounted to 211 *aspers* (20 *hyperpyra* 10 *karati*)<sup>2</sup>. This figure is in line with those for wool purchases in Gelibolu the following year. 51 sacks of "lana suzida" were bought for 4,818 *aspers* with expenses amounting to 1,232 *aspers*, and 28 sacks of "lana lavada" were sold for 3,143 *aspers* with expenses of 806 *aspers*. In both cases the expenses amount to approximately 25.5% of the purchase price<sup>3</sup>.

As well as exporting raw material and fabrics, Turchia also imported cloth both from the East and the West. Silk fabrics and brocade such as *kamkha* stuffs came in from Baghdad<sup>4</sup> and worked silk was imported from Alexandria<sup>5</sup>. Iranian merchants came to Bursa to sell their silk and other expensive commodities such as chinese porcelain, musk and rhubarb from China and Central Asia and bought there European cloth, precious velvets and brocades, and woollens which they

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.ix.22 = *ibid*, c.51, p.102, c.116, p.235.

<sup>2</sup> 1437.ix. = Badoer, *Libro*, c.116, p.234, c.57, p.115. The exchange rate was nine *hyperpyra* per 100 *aspers*. 73 *aspers* (8 *hyperpyra*) were listed for unspecified expenses and 138 *aspers* (12 *hyperpyra* 10 *karati*) for portorage at six *aspers* (0.5 of a *hyperpyron*) per *kantar*.

<sup>3</sup> 1438.ix.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.247, p.496, c.175, p.353

<sup>4</sup> Ashtor, *Social and Economic History*, p.262

<sup>5</sup> Piloti, p.36.

took back with them to Iran<sup>1</sup>. Linen came from Upper Egypt and "toile soubtile", worked in Alexandria, was exported to Anatolia<sup>2</sup>.

Turchia, and indeed the Near East as a whole, was very much a market for imported European cloth, not merely luxury fabrics but also of other materials. Florentine cloth was imported in great quantity into the Levant<sup>3</sup>. In Egypt the wearing of clothes made from European cloth became fashionable, as is attested by Leonardo Frescobaldi, a Tuscan pilgrim who passed through Cairo in 1384 on his way to the Holy Land. He described the costume of the women he saw there stating that their dresses were mostly of well-worked silk, under which they wore either Rhenish cloth or high quality Alexandrian linen<sup>4</sup>. Referring to roughly the same period, al-Maqrizi wrote that Egyptians began wearing European cloth, particularly woollens, at the beginning of the fifteenth century<sup>5</sup>.

Many different types of European cloth arrived in the markets of Turchia. At the beginning of the fourteenth century Gabriel de Pinu took cloth of Chalons from Cyprus to

---

<sup>1</sup> İnalcık, 'The Ottoman Economic Mind and Aspects of the Ottoman Economy', p.211.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.35.

<sup>3</sup> Ashtor, 'Underdevelopment', pp.305-306.

<sup>4</sup> Frescobaldi, p.47.

<sup>5</sup> al-Khitat I, p.217, cited by Ashtor, 'Underdevelopment' p.298, who also cites the French translation in R Dozy, *Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes* (Amsterdam, 1845), p.128.

Alanya<sup>1</sup>. Silk came into Turchia from Chios where it was taxed on export from 1354<sup>2</sup>. Camlets were imported from Cyprus into Antalya<sup>3</sup> where merchants traded pistache-green, scarlet and yellow cloths and *panni gentili*, buckram, a fine material, camlets (*cambellotti*), and woollens such as *scarlattini*, a fine woollen cloth, cloths of Lombardy, Narbonne<sup>4</sup> and Perpignan<sup>5</sup>. Azure, turquoise, emerald green, pistache-green and scarlet cloths, Perpignans, cloth of Toulouse and dyed woollens of Florence, coloured in the manner of Narbonnes, cloth of Chalon and cloth of Narbonne all appeared in the market of Theologos<sup>6</sup>. In 1394 one bale of tafeta (*tapetis*) was loaded onto the ship of a Genoese merchant in Chios bound for Theologos<sup>7</sup>. In 1437 four bales containing 32 *peze* of *pani bastardi* were imported into Constantinople. Sixteen of them were destined for Grezia and 16 for Turchia<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1305?.viii.7 = Lamberto di Sambuceto, no.28, pp.48-49.

<sup>2</sup> Argenti, Chios I, pp.427-428.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, pp.57-58, presumably from Cyprus as they had to be sealed with the seal of Cyprus.

<sup>4</sup> According to Evans, the name was sometimes used rather as an indication of quality than of geographical origin, Pegolotti, p.425.

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, pp.57-58. The term *Panni pirpignani* had by the fourteenth century ceased to have any geographical connection, the cloth in fact coming from Florence, Pegolotti, p.425.

<sup>6</sup> Pegolotti, pp.55-58.

<sup>7</sup> 1394.ix.24 = ASG, Notaio Donato de Clavaro, sc.39, filze 1, doc.182.

<sup>8</sup> 1437.ix.19 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.108, p.218.

One of the main markets was Bursa. It is difficult to gauge the exact amount of cloth imported, but in 1436 fine ("fini") Florentine cloth was sent there<sup>1</sup> as were, in the following year, one *pano de grana*<sup>2</sup>, three *pani* Fiorenza, of which two were "turchini" and one "verde"<sup>3</sup>. Cloth did not always sell in Bursa. The three Florentine cloths were sent back the following year<sup>4</sup>. In the same year four *pani*, consisting of two "turchini da Fiorenza", one "verde Fiorenza" and one "scarlato da Mantoa", were sent back to Constantinople from Bursa. The reasons for this are not clear. The cloth may have been defective or it may simply not have sold. Whatever the case, this deal must have been rather expensive for the merchant for expenses involved in sending it to Bursa amounted to 8.45 *hyperpyra* while those for sending it back came to 67 *aspers* (six *hyperpyra* nine *karati*)<sup>5</sup>. Bursa was not just a market for western merchants to sell, but also to buy imported western cloth. In 1438 Christofal Bonifazio bought a *peza* of *zanbeloto chochola* in Bursa for 60 *asper* (5.7 *hyperpyra*) which was sent to Venice

---

<sup>1</sup> 1436.ix.4 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.14, p.28.

<sup>2</sup> 1437.iii.16 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.54, p.109.

<sup>3</sup> 1437.iii.16 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.61, p.122, c.14, p.29.

<sup>4</sup> 1438.x.14 = *ibid*, c.261, p.524.

<sup>5</sup> 1438.ix.13 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.240, p.482, c.227, p.457; 1438.xii.29 = c.306, p.614, c.240, p.483; 1438.xii.28 = c.61, p.123.



as a present for Giacomo Badoer's brother Jeronimo<sup>1</sup>

European cloth was also imported into the markets of Edirne and Tekirdağ, Samsun and Sinop. In 1436 Andrea Rixa, a Greek who lived in Edirne, owed money for "pano un loesto e alcuni chavezi de loeste"<sup>2</sup>. In 1438, 38 *pichi* of "damascin biancho brochà d'oro e de seda" was imported from Constantinople to Edirne by Jachomo Chanpi<sup>3</sup> and 1.5 *pichi* of *pano negro*, valued at three *hyperpyra* 9 *karati*, were imported into Tekirdağ (Rodosto)<sup>4</sup>. In 1436 one bale of *pani loesti* was loaded in Constantinople for Sinop<sup>5</sup>. Samsun seems to have been an active cloth market and much cloth was shipped there from Constantinople. Four "pani loesti", consisting of three "scarlatini" and one "verde" were loaded in 1436 onto the ship of Galeoto Lomelin for Samsun (Simiso)<sup>6</sup>. The following year 60 *peze* of *bochasini* "de più cholori, zoè biavi e verde e bianchi", sold there at various prices, totalling 1,184 *aspers* (62.3 *hyperpyra*); two *peze* of *zanbeloti*, one blue and one black, were sold for 126 *aspers* (6.6 *hyperpyra*), and tafeta ("zendadi peze ... palmi 20") for

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.xii.28 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.301, p.604, c.227, p.457. The exchange rate given is 10.5 *aspers* to one *hyperpyron*.

<sup>2</sup> 1436.xi.1 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.37, p.74.

<sup>3</sup> 1438.x. = Badoer, *Libro*, c.244, p.490.

<sup>4</sup> 1438.vii.9 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.197, p.396, c.188, p.379.

<sup>5</sup> 1436.ix.7 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.7, p.14, c.13, p.27.

<sup>6</sup> 1436.ii.12 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.44, p.88, c.13, p.27.

70 *aspers* (3.7 *hyperpyra*)<sup>1</sup>. The *zanbeloti* and *tafeta* were bought by Antonio de Negroponte, who was taking goods to Samsun and Trabzon, for his own use ("ch'el tene per chaxa soa"). The *bochasini* was sold in Trabzon for 2,773 *aspers* (69.3 *hyperpyra*, 40 Trabzon *aspers* to one *hyperpyron*), making a difference of seven *hyperpyra* between the sale price in Samsun and the more expensive price in Trabzon.

Cloth came into Turchia from other parts of the Aegean. *Saia d'Irlanda* was shipped from Famagusta to Rhodes and Turchia. In 1361 Manulio Verigo de Candida received 38 pieces of *saia Irlanda*, valued at 570 silver *bessants* of Cyprus, from Michalio Marino de Candida. These pieces he was to add to those already in his possession, making a total of 76 pieces. With these he was to go to Rhodes, or Milas or Theologos or Balat (Palatia) where he was to sell the cloth. He was then to buy goods to the value of the 570 silver *bessants* at which the cloth was valued, and which he would receive from the sale, and send the goods he bought back to Michalio in Famagusta, where Michalio would sell them. Any profit over and above the initial 570 silver *bessants* was to be split between them, one quarter going to Manulio, three quarters to Michalio. After buying commodities in Rhodes or Milas or Theologos or Balat, Manulio was to go to Antalya ("partibus Atalie") to buy goods, and from there sail to Cyprus, to Paphos or Limasol or Cyrenia, where he was to spend the remaining money, presumably trading, before

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.152, p.306, c.152, p.307. The exchange rate for Samsun *aspers* to *hyperpyron* is given as 19:1.

returning to Famagusta<sup>1</sup>.

As with all other commodities, the Genoese were heavily involved in the importation of cloth into Turchia. As early as the end of the thirteenth century cloth was being traded there by the Genoese from Caffa. In 1290 Babillano de Nigro received in accomodation from Conrado Pichamillio £G 638, 16s., 6d. "implicatos" in 155 pieces of "tellarum de Campania subalbium" (cloth of Champagne). Babillano was to sail from Caffa with the cloth to trade it in Turchia<sup>2</sup>. Genoese merchants brought cloth into Balat<sup>3</sup> and into Theologos, which was apparently one of the principal destinations of cloth imported by Genoese merchants. In 1377 Domenico Cattaneo hired a *cocha* and loaded, among other things, 100 pieces of cloth. The *cocha* was to sail via Gaeta and Naples to Chios and Theologos<sup>4</sup>. In the same year bundles of saye and cloth were sent to Theologos from Genoa<sup>5</sup>. In 1382, 20 pieces of cloth of Beovays were loaded in Genoa for Theologos<sup>6</sup>. In 1394 a bale of camlets was loaded in Chios onto the *cocha* of Bernarbonus Dentutus to be taken to Theologos<sup>7</sup>. It appears that Bernarbono was also to load in Theologos cloth imported

---

<sup>1</sup> 1361.xi.1 = Nicola de Boateriis, no.114, p.116.

<sup>2</sup> 1290.v.23 = Bratianu, *Actes*, no.330, p.297.

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, p.72.

<sup>4</sup> 1377 = Musso, *Navigazione*, pp.169-170.

<sup>5</sup> Day, *Douanes* II, p.737.

<sup>6</sup> 1382.vi.7 = ASG, Cartulare 381, f4r-v.

<sup>7</sup> 1394.ix.24 = ASG, Notaio Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filze 1, doc.182.

there by a recently deceased merchant, Veri Francisco Fori de Florai, whose will declared that he had left in Theologos, with a Genoese, Bartholomeo de Castro, one bale of cloth of eight pieces of wide English cloth and one *fardello* of "arnisiorum" which was to be loaded in Theologos on the *cocha* of Bernabono Dentuto and taken to Rhodes. Veri confirmed that he had loaded in Chios on the *cocha* of Bernabono Dentuto six bales of cloth and one *fardello* in which six bales there were 52 pieces of wide English cloth and in the *fardello* there were 18 *staperronos* of the same cloth. They were to be shipped to Rhodes<sup>1</sup>.

Genoese cloth was also traded into Turchia. In 1452 cloth of Genoa of various colours formed part of negotiations over the tax farm of alum mines. Three merchants, Paris Giustiniano, Paulo Bocardo and Benedetto Salvaigo, offered 400 pieces, worth c.5,000 Chian gold *ducats*, as part payment to Francesco de Draperiis if he was successful in renewing from the Ottoman Sultan the *appalto* of alum mines in Turchia and Grecia. The cloth could be taken by Francesco, at the risk of the receiving merchants, to Edirne<sup>2</sup>. The cloth may have been intended as a gift for the Sultan or as part of Francesco's payment. The three merchants undertook to settle 45,000 Turkish *akçes* in Edirne if Francesco was successful in obtaining the alum tax farm. The fact that Edirne is

---

<sup>1</sup> 1394.xi.9 = ASG, Donato de Clavaro Sc.39 filze 1, doc.197. I presume from the date of this document that the voyage referred to is the same as that which appears in doc. 182 (1394.ix.24).

<sup>2</sup> 1452.x.28 = Argenti, *Chios*, III, p.658-659.

specifically mentioned as the place to which Francesco could take the cloth, as well as the place of settlement, may indicate that the Sultan was in Edirne at this time. On the other hand, it may be that the reason Francesco was to go to Edirne was to sell the cloth, which would indicate that Edirne was an important cloth market.

Some markets clearly were very important cloth centres. Bursa, during the fourteenth century the economic centre of the Ottoman Empire upon which the trade routes of Anatolia converged, was a major cloth market. Something is known of how the Bursa silk market worked in the later fifteenth century and it seems reasonable to assume that the same system had been in operation there for some time since Bursa had by then been in Ottoman hands for well over a century. On arrival, silk was transported to the caravansaray with the *mizan* (balance) for silk, the only place where sales were permitted. Sales were under the control of the *Kethüda* (steward) and the *Simsar* (broker) who appointed the *Dellal* (broker, who collected the brokerage tax, the *dellaliye*). No sale could be transacted or silk spun without the *Simsar*'s permission, and he too prevented any attempt by the merchants to increase the weight of their silk by making it wet. After the sale, the *Simsar* issued a document certifying full payment of tax without which the owner of the silk could not leave the caravansaray. The *Kethüda* placed under seal the money from sales due to the Sultan and oversaw the activities of the *Simsar*. All sales had to be transacted in the

presence of both officials<sup>1</sup>.

The market of Antalya had special requirements and the merchants there preferred to buy certain cloths in certain lengths, Lombardy in 40 piece lengths and cloth of Narbonne and Perpignan in 200 piece lengths<sup>2</sup>. Cloth had to be coloured, with good bright scarlets, yellows and pistache-greens. All cloths had to be sheared once, that is with half nap. Soft cloths and Scarlattini, a fine woollen cloth, had to be sheared in the same way once, but done well on the inside. Buckram and camlets (*cambellotti*) were sold there by the piece. Woollens too were sold by piece or by cut such as *scarlattini*, which was sold by cut or by the *braccia*<sup>3</sup>.

In Theologos too, cloth was sold by certain measurements. Cloth of Chalons [?] (Celona) was to be sold in 20 piece lengths, while that of Narbonne had to be sold there in 18 *ancone* lengths of Theologos or 12 *canne* of Cyprus. Woollens were sold there by the measurement called the *accono*. One cloth of Narbonne was equivalent to 18 *ancone* of Theologos while one *canne* of Florence was one and 5/12ths of an *ancone*<sup>4</sup>.

Although the Turkish merchants who bought cloth from the westerners in Turchia are usually anonymous in western sources, they do occasionally appear by name. In 1436 a Turk

---

<sup>1</sup> İnalçık, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar', p.58; Beldiceanu, *Recherche sur la Ville Ottomane*, pp.109-111.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.55.

called Ahmed from Lichomidia (?Nicomedia, Izmit) bought 63 *kantars* 50 *rotols* of grapes ("zebibo") of Lichomidia, valued at two *hyperpyra* per *kantar* for two *pani* of *pani loesti*, one green and one turquoise, valued at 52.5 *hyperpyra* per *peza*<sup>1</sup>. In the same year Jael, factor of Muxalach (?Mu`ala') bought 12 *pani loesti*, eight scarlet, two turquoise and two green, at a cost of 815 *hyperpyra* 21 *karati*<sup>2</sup>.

It is possible to establish some sort of guide as to what prices different types of cloth fetched in the markets of Turchia, although, as with any financial data for this period, any conclusions must be speculative and broad, there simply not being a large and accurate body of figures extant while the problems of inflation and conversion of one currency to another constantly hamper calculation.

IMPORTED CLOTH PRICES				
DATE	CLOTH	PLACE	PRICE	SOURCE
1290	155 pieces of cloth of Champagne	Caffa	£G638 16s 6D	1290.v.23 = Bratianu, <i>Actes</i> , no.330, p.297
1297	cotton	Cyprus	4 <u>besanti saracinali</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1297.iii.11 = Lamberto di Sambuceto
1299	cotton from of Aleppo	Cyprus	60 <u>besanti saracinali</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1299.v.22 = ibid

<sup>1</sup> 1436.i.14 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.42, p.84, c.13, p.27, c.43, p.86, c.42, p.85. But there is a difference in the figures given. The two entries giving the amount of cloth have a total of 105 *hyperpyra*, the two dealing with the quantities of grapes have 127 *hyperpyra*.

<sup>2</sup> 1436.x.7 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.13, p.27.

1300	Lombardy and French cloth	Cyprus	3,948 <u>bessants</u> = 33 pieces of Lombardy cloth and 27 of French cloth	1300.ii.2 = Desimoni, no.42, pp.25-28
1300	cloth of Avignon	Cyprus	968.5 <u>soldi</u> , 8 <u>denari</u> = 4 bales	1300.ix.30 = Lamberto di Sambuceto p.
1300	cloth of Lombardy and cloth "de Taolonis"	Cyprus	1,200 <u>soldi</u> = 3 bales of Lombardy and 1 bale of "taolonis"	1300.ix.30 = ibid
1307	cotton of Syria	Cyprus	28 silver <u>bessants</u> = 1 <u>kantar</u>	1307.iv.5 = ibid
1309	cloth of Chalons	?	252 <u>libri</u> 1 <u>solidus</u> = 2 bales (= 13 pieces)	1309.xi.5 = Giovanni de Rocha
1310-40	buckram of Erzincan	Pisa	3 <u>denari</u> per piece	Pegolotti, p.208
1310-40	cloth of Narbonne.	Theologos	14 gold <u>florins</u> per cloth = 18 <u>ancone</u> of Theologos	ibid, p.55
1310-40	dyed woolens of Florence	Theologos	2 - 2.25 gold <u>florins</u> = 1 <u>canna</u>	ibid, p.55
1310-40	? dyed woolens of Florence	Theologos	32 - 36 gold <u>florins</u> = 1 piece (= 12 <u>canne</u> and 2 <u>braccia</u> of Florence)	ibid, p.55
1310-40	cloth of Chalons	Antalya	8 - 10 <u>bessants</u> of Cyprus = 1 <u>canna</u>	ibid, p.58
1310-40	Narbonne:	Antalya	9 - 12 gold <u>florins</u> = 1 piece	ibid, p.58
1310-40	Perpignan	Antalya	9 - 12 gold <u>florins</u> = 1 piece	ibid
1310-40	Lombardy cloth	Antalya	8 - 9 gold <u>florins</u> = 1 piece	ibid
1310-40	Turkish silk	Pisa	6 <u>soldi</u> per <u>centinaio di libbre</u>	ibid, pp.208-209
1310-40	cloth of Chalons	Antalya	8 - 10 <u>bessants</u> of Cyprus = 1 <u>canna</u>	ibid, p.58



1361	<u>saia Irlanda</u>	Chios	570 silver <u>bessants</u> of Cyprus = 38 pieces	1361.xi.1 = Nicola de Boateriis, no.114, p.116
1391	Florentine cloth	?Pera	19 <u>hyperpyra</u> 6 <u>karati</u> = 7 pieces	1391.xii.19 = ASG, Antico Comune 22, ff.70, 92
1392	<u>panni rosee</u>	"	21 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 7 pieces	ibid. ff.74.193
1392	Florentine cloth	"	21 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 7 pieces	ibid. ff.76, 193
1392	Florentine cloth	"	21 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 7 pieces	ibid. ff.78, 196
1392	cloth	"	17 <u>hyperpyra</u> 12 <u>karati</u> = 7 pieces	ibid. ff.88, 175
1392	<u>panni rosee de</u> <u>grana</u>	"	32 <u>hyperpyra</u> 12 <u>karati</u> = 6 pieces	ibid. ff.84, 197
1392	<u>panni rosse</u>	"	16 <u>hyperpyra</u> 9 <u>karati</u> = 6 pieces	ibid. ff.84, 92
1392	<u>panni rose</u>	"	18 <u>hyperpyra</u> 10 <u>karati</u> = 6 pieces	ibid. f.128
1392	<u>panni virgili</u> <u>Florentie</u>	"	36 <u>hyperpyra</u> 3 <u>karati</u> = 13 pieces	ibid. f.174
1408	Florentine cloth	?	65 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 piece	1408.viii.14 = ASG, Notaio Giovanni Blabi, Sc.46, filze 1, doc.384
1436	<u>pani loesti</u>	C'ple	47.5 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>peza</u>	1436.ii.12 = Bader, <u>Libro</u> . c.44, p.88, c.13, p.27
1437	Florentine cloth	C'ple	150 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>peza</u>	1437.iii.16 = ibid. c.14, p.29

1437	<u>pani loesti</u>	Samsun	7,355 <u>aspers</u> ( 700 <u>hyperpyra</u> ) = 12 <u>casete</u>	1437.xii.18 = ibid. c.44, p.89
1437	tafeta	Samsun	172 <u>aspers</u> (9 <u>hyperpyra</u> ) = 20 <u>palmi</u>	1437.xii.18 = ibid. c. 52, p.306
1437	<u>zanbeloti</u>	Samsun	126 <u>aspers</u> (6.6 <u>hyperpyra</u> ) = 2 <u>peze</u>	1437.xii.18 = ibid. c.152, p.306
1437	<u>bocasini</u>	Samsun	1,184 <u>aspers</u> (62 <u>hyperpyra</u> ) = 60 <u>peze</u>	1437.xii.18 = ibid. c.152, p.306
1437	<u>bocasini</u>	Trabzon	2,773 <u>aspers</u> (69 <u>hyperpyra</u> ) = 60 <u>peze</u>	1437.xii.18 = ibid. c.152, p.307
1438	<u>pani negri</u>	C'ple	100 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>peza</u>	1438.iv.30 = ibid. c.196, p.394; 1438.iii.21 = ibid
1438	muslin	Bursa	7,355 <u>aspers</u> (700 <u>hyperpyra</u> ) = 12 <u>casete</u>	1438.viii.8 = ibid. c.227, p.456, c.61, p.123
1438	<u>damascin bianco</u> <u>brochà d'oro e de</u> <u>seda</u>	C'ple	10.5 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>picho</u>	1438.ix.16 = ibid. c.244, p.490
1438	<u>damascin verde</u> <u>scieto</u>	"	6 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>picho</u>	1438.ix.16 = ibid. c.244, p.490
1439	<u>pano bastardo</u> <u>(verde)</u>	"	65 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>peza</u>	1439.ii.26 = ibid. c.329, p.660

1439	<u>pani bastardi</u>	"	95 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>peza</u>	1439.ii.26 = ibid, c.329, p.660
1439	<u>pani da Parma</u> ( <u>pano zalo</u> )	"	90 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>peza</u>	1439.ii.26 = ibid, c.329, p.660
1439	<u>pano scarlatini</u> <u>bastardo</u>	"	89 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>peza</u>	1439.iv.18 = ibid, c.329, p.660
1439	<u>pani Fiorenza de</u> <u>garbo</u>	"	80 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 1 <u>peza</u>	1439.iv.20 = ibid, c.329, p.660
1439	<u>chanevaze</u>	"	14 <u>hyperpyra</u> = 100 <u>pichi</u>	1439.xi.16 = ibid, c.343, p.689
1452	Genoese cloth	?	c.500 gold <u>ducats</u> of Chios = 400 pieces	1452.x.28 = Argenti, <u>Chios</u> . III, pp.658-659

It seems that trading cloth was a profitable business. In 1436 four "pani loesti" were valued in Constantinople at 47.5 *hyperpyra* per *peza*. The same cloth sold in Samsun for 21 Turkish *ducats* per *peza*, or 756 *aspers*<sup>1</sup>. Calculating at 11 Turkish *aspers* per *hyperpyron*, the cloth cost in Samsun for c.67 *hyperpyra* per *peza*, or around 19.5 *hyperpyra* per *peza* more than in Constantinople, an increase of approximately 40%. While it is true that this increase must have covered transport costs, insurance, customs and other charges, it still seems a considerable mark up and indicates

---

<sup>1</sup> 1436.ii.12 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.44, p.88, c.13, p.27 (in Constantinople); 1437.xii.18 = ibid, c.44, p.89 (in Samsun). The exchange rate was given as 36 *aspers* per Turkish *ducat*.

how rewarding trading cloth into Turchia must have been for western merchants. Expenses could have been in the region of 5% of the sale price for in 1438 "damascin biancho brochà d'oro" was taken by Jachomo da Chanpi to Edirne. Expenses on taking the cloth there amounted to 10 *hyperpyra* with an additional expense in Edirne of 219 *aspers*. The cloth sold for 4,680 *aspers*, thus making the expenses c.5% of the sale price<sup>1</sup>.

Of the taxes which affected cloth, one of the most important for import-export was customs. What customs were specifically charged on cloth, either imported or exported, in the period before 1453 is not known for certain. It may have been a commodity which was not charged at any specific rate but was included in commodities in general for it appears in the treaties between Aydın and Venice and in those between Menteşe and Venice as merely one of various listed commodities upon which a flat rate customs charge was levied. On the other hand, it is perhaps a little sup<sup>r</sup>prising that, being an item of such importance in trade between Turchia and the various western states, it did not attract a special

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.x. = Badoer, *Libro*, c.244, p.490, 1439.iii.5, 1439.iii.12 = *ibid*, c.244, p.491. The listed expense of 10 *hyperpyra* was for "la mia provixion, per provixion de achatar e vender e mandar in Andr[enopoli] e scuoder la moneda, e spexa fata in pano, inzerado e canevazo e taole e per far ligar el damascin brochà". Th damascine sold in Edirne for 4,680 *aspers*, at the rate of 120 *aspers* per *picho* from which 219 *aspers* on expenses were deducted, leaving a total of 4,461 *aspers*. The expenses were made up of a *comerchium* of 2% making 93 *aspers*, brokerage at 0.5 % making 23 *aspers*, 10 *aspers* for storage and 93 *aspers* for provisions. The rate of exchange for the *aspers* was 10.5 *aspers* two *tornexi* per *hyperpyron* for 3,000 *aspers* and 10.5 *aspers* 4 *tornexi* per *hyperpyron* for 1,461 *aspers*.

customs charge, such as that applied to grain, livestock or slaves. The absence of any such rate can perhaps be explained by the haphazard nature of the sources which have survived from the earlier period, although this argument is of course rather open to question. If one however looks at Ottoman sources for the second half of the fifteenth century, one sees that in this period at least cloth, both imported and exported, did attract a specific customs rate.

In the second half of the fifteenth century various customs rates were charged on cloth, both imported and exported. Imported cloth (*kumaş*) was charged in Bursa at the rate of 3% on Muslims, tributaries and infidel merchants from Venice, Genoa, Chios and other places, indigenous infidels being exempt<sup>1</sup>. Cloth (*kumaş*) imported into Istanbul and Galata by sea was charged for Muslims and tributaries at 4%, the same rate being levied from the same people on Frankish cloth (*firengi kumaş*), brocade of Caffa (*Kefe kemhası*), broadcloth (*çuka*), white cotton cloth/linen (*akbez*) and flax/linen (*keten*<sup>2</sup>), being imported by land. Cloth (*kumaş*) coming from this side of the border of Gelibolu, if off-loaded either this side or the other side, was to be charged customs on Muslims, tributaries and Franks of 4%. Muslims and tributaries bringing Frankish cloth (*firengi kumaş*) and silk thread (*ibrüşim*) and broad cloth (*çuka*) and other cloth

---

<sup>1</sup> 1454-63 or 1479-81 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.30, pp.40-41; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.30, clauses 2,3, pp.104-105.

<sup>2</sup> Beldiceanu translates this as cloths of linen.

(*gayri kumaş*) from Mudanya paid 4%<sup>1</sup>. At some time after January 1476 Muslims and tributaries importing cloth (*kumaş*) by land or sea into various ports from Istanbul to the borders of Aydınili paid 4% while non-tributaries paid 5%<sup>2</sup>. At the beginning of 1476 Frankish cloth (*firengi kumaş*), brocade of Caffa (*Kefe kemhası*<sup>3</sup>) and cloth of Bursa (*Burusa kumaşı*) imported by land or sea into the same areas paid customs of 4%<sup>4</sup>. In 1481 Franks importing cloth (*kumaş*) by land paid 4%, while *raiyya* and tributaries were exempt. Muslims importing Frankish cloth (*firengi kumaş*), broadcloth (*çuka*), silk thread (*ibrüşim*) and other cloth (*gayri kumaş*) from Mudanya were charged at a rate of 1%, tributaries at 2% and Franks at 4%<sup>5</sup>. In 1482 customs charged on ships from Venice, Rum and "other infidel vilayets" off-loading silk thread (*ibrişim*) and other cloth (*gayri kumaşlar*) was 4%. Frankish merchants importing cloth (*kumaş*) by land into Samsun and Sinop in 1482 paid customs of 4% while *raiyya* and

---

<sup>1</sup> Post 1453.v.29 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.36, pp.49-50; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.37, clause 2, pp.116-118.

<sup>2</sup> Post 1476.i.28 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.35, pp.47-48; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.36, clause 4, p.114.

<sup>3</sup> Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, p.74, have in their text " kece ve kemhasından" while Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, p.147, note 1, has corrected "kece", by analogy with doc. 36, to "Kefe". This seems more convincing than the original also because of the possessive suffix on "kemhasından", which is otherwise out of place.

<sup>4</sup> 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, p.74; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.54, clause 5, p.147.

<sup>5</sup> 1481.viii.26/ix.24 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.55, p.79; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.56, clause 1,2,3, p.151.

tributaries paid no customs<sup>1</sup>. On export cloth, 3% was levied in Bursa from Muslims, tributaries, indigenous infidels and infidel merchants from Venice, Genoa, Chios and other places<sup>2</sup>.

Thus for the period c.1453 to 1482 Latins paid on imported cloth either 4% ,5% or, in the case of the Genoese and Venetians in Bursa, 3%, that being the rate also imposed on Muslims and tributaries. The rate paid by Muslims changed from 4% dropping in 1481 and 1482 to 1% with tributaries paying 2%. If cloth was charged a special customs rate in the Ottoman empire before 1453 the most likely rate, judging from the these figures, was probably something between 3% and 5% for Latins with Muslims paying perhaps 1% less since for most of the reign of Mehmed II there was a difference of 1% in customs levied on Muslims and tributaries on the one hand and non-tributaries on the other, the ratio of 4% for non-Muslims and non-tributaries, 2% for tributaries and 1% for Muslims appearing only in these documents for 1481 and 1482.

Other taxes charged on cloth included brokerage. *Senseraggio* was paid in Constantinople and Pera on camlets.

Camlets (*cambellotti*) paid 4 *karati* per 100 *hyperpyra*, the same rate applying to silks and cloth of gold<sup>3</sup>. In 1476 brokerage tax (*dellalık*) on cloth (*kumaş*) and broadcloth

---

<sup>1</sup> 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.57, clause 3,4, pp.152-153.

<sup>2</sup> 1454-63 or 1479-81 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.30, pp.40-41; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.30, clauses 2,3, pp.104-105.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.45.

(*çuka*) in Istanbul and Galata was in the hands of taxfarmers ("üç yıla mukata`aya verdüm")<sup>1</sup>.

*Bac*, the tax taken at the *mizan* (the balance used for cloth and other commodities which were not very weighty, in contrast to the *kapan* where heavy goods such as foodstuffs were weighed) was charged under Mehmed II on cloth at the rate of 2 *akçe* per *yük*<sup>2</sup>.

Tax collection on cloth was probably handled in the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries by tax farmers. Linen was apparently usually under tax farmers in Aydın, but was exempted for the Venetians under their treaty with Hızır in 1337<sup>3</sup>. The situation was the same in Menteşe, where too the Venetians were exempt<sup>4</sup>. According to Professor Zachariadou, there was an attempt to impose a monopoly on imported textiles, but this was unsuccessful. To support this, she refers to the treaties of 1337 between Venice and Aydın and Venice and Menteşe. This, however, relies on interpreting *appalto/gabella* as monopoly which it does not seem to have meant<sup>5</sup>. After 1453 tax on cloth was farmed.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1476.i.28/ii.6 = Anhegger and İnalçık, *Kanunname*, no.53, pp.73-74; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.54, clause 1, p.146.

<sup>2</sup> İnalçık, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar', p.57.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192.

<sup>4</sup> 1337.pre iv. = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 22, p. 222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, 1403M DVL, clause 22, p.231; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 22, p.236.

<sup>5</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.170. On *appalto/gabella* see above, ch. II.



In 892/1487, for example, the collection of tax, which would have included the *bac* collected on cloth, at the *mizan* of Bursa was farmed out<sup>1</sup>. In 883 the tax farm on measuring of cloth in Bursa was sold for 58 800 *akçe* or 1,200 gold *florins*<sup>2</sup>.

Merchants in cloth attempted to defraud the tax officials. One of the ways in which fraud was attempted over cloth sales in the later part of the fifteenth century was an arrangement between a Muslim and an infidel whereby they agreed to declare the infidel's cloth (*kumaşlar*) as belonging to the Muslim thereby avoiding the customs payable by a non-Muslim. Such fraud, punishable by the *yasak kulu*<sup>3</sup>, was presumably not new but practiced earlier in the century.

On an individual level, disputes between Genoese merchants and Turks went to arbitration. In 1414 a Genoese citizen, Rafaele Centurionis, and Giovanni Paterio, a citizen of Chios, agent for Alemanno Sofiano of Old Phokaea and acting also for "Catip Bassa Turchus de Bergamo", (Katib Paşa from Bergama, in western Anatolia near the coast opposite Mitylini), went to arbitration in Chios over the sale made that year in which Raffaele had bought cotton from Alamano and Katib Paşa<sup>4</sup>. Unfortunately this document gives no

---

<sup>1</sup> İnalcık, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar', p.57.

<sup>2</sup> İnalcık, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar', p.60. The exchange rate was 1 *florin* to 49 *akçe*.

<sup>3</sup> 1482.i.20 = Anhegger and İnalcık, *Kanunname*, no.56, p.80; Beldiceanu, *Actes*, I, no.57, clause 6, p.153.

<sup>4</sup> 1414.iv.2 = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46 filze 1, doc.286. See Appendix One, doc.14.

details, as it is merely a preparatory agreement to go to arbitration rather than being part of the case itself. It does, however, show that disputes between Genoese and Turkish traders did go to arbitration under Genoese jurisdiction. It would be interesting to know if this was always the case or if on occasion such disputes were settled under Turkish jurisdiction in this period. Here perhaps the sale took place in Chios and the case was therefore to be heard there. It does seem that there were controls over where the case could be heard. In 1413 Hacı Satıoğlu (? Sati oğlu), ambassador of Cüneyd, the ruler of Aydın at that time, appeared before the Podestà of Chios to protest over a court case involving one of Cüneyd's subjects, Hacı Sarti, who was claiming against the *fedeicommissors* of the late Sorleone Salvaigo. As Hacı Sarti had been unable to attend the court, for unspecified reasons, the case had been postponed for one year. Hacı Sarti was, however, still unable to appear in court and had heard that the Genoese authorities now wished to have the case tried in Genoa. Cüneyd's ambassador protested to the Podestà that this was unjust ("*iniuriöse et cavilöse*")<sup>1</sup>. It is not clear whether the phrase means actually unlawful, or if it simply means that insisting on trying the case in Genoa would be unjust, presumably as Hacı Sarti would be unable to attend and would therefore receive no legal redress. That Turks did have legal rights against Genoese citizens in Genoese courts is clear from the case in Pera against Ottobono Giustiniano

---

<sup>1</sup> 1413.viii.28 = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, folze 1. doc.255. See Appendix One, doc.13.

and Ettore de Flisco. Turks with any complaints against the former authorities in Pera were requested to come forward<sup>1</sup>.

If there were disputes over sales in Turchia, it would be interesting to know before whom they were settled. Disputes between Genoese and other European merchants were, judging from a document enacted in Turchia in 1383, settled before Genoese officials. Rodol Dalan Theotonito<sup>2</sup>, servant of Hernes, brought a case before the court of the *Capitaneus* and *Consilium* against a Genoese citizen, Quilico Gentile, accusing Quilico of having, out of "boldness and arrogance", struck him on the hands with a shoe, and then in the eye with his fist, drawing blood, and then on the head three or four times. When questioned, Quilico replied that in fact Rodol had hit him on the ear with the back of his hand and that he, Quilico, had not touched Rodol with his shoes. Quilico was ordered by the *Capitaneus* and *Consilium* to put up 200 gold florins as bail and Luca Gentile interceded for him<sup>3</sup>.

Presumably it would have been very much in the interests of the Genoese to have any disputes involving their nationals tried before their own courts. Whether they were, or were not, able to ensure this must have depended on the strength of the Turks with whom they were dealing. Thus, perhaps, disputes in the earlier part of the fourteenth century in the beyliks would have gone before Genoese officials. On the

---

<sup>1</sup> 1402.x.30 = ASG, San Giorgio 34 590/1306, ff.16r-17r.

<sup>2</sup> The name Theotonito may mean the he was Teutonic, this being a Greek rendering.

<sup>3</sup> 1383.vii.20 = ASG, Notai Cartulare 381, f.146v.

other hand, it seems highly unlikely that, under the early Ottomans, Genoa would have been able to enforce such a control. This obviously concerns only individual complaints between merchants and not disputes with state officials.

Cloth was a commodity of considerable importance in the trade of Turchia in the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries. In general, raw materials, such as cotton and wool, were exported westward and finished products, the various European cloths, imported. It was not, however, totally an exchange of raw materials and finished products for Turchia also produced its own luxury cloths and exported silks. As a major item of trade, cloth must have generated a great deal of income both for individual merchants and for the state through the collection of customs.

## SECTION 5: METALS

Any study of the metal trade into Anatolia is severely hampered by lack of data. This is due not only to the haphazard survival of documents, something which affects all research into all aspects of this area and period, but also Christian trading of metals with the infidel was banned by governments and Church. The arms trade is particularly difficult to trace. Weapons clearly did arrive in Anatolia. Aşıkpaşazade refers to there being no firearms in the reign of Bayezid, but plenty in the time of the Sultans Murad II and Mehmed II<sup>1</sup>. The Genoese were known to be importing large quantities of arms into the Levant<sup>2</sup>, though this does not mean that they were necessarily trading them with the Turks<sup>3</sup>. So far no reference to arms trading with the Turks has been found in the Genoese sources for this period. An added complication when tracing the movement of metals is the fact that the origin of the metals traded is often not given.

Nevertheless, there clearly was a metal trade between

---

<sup>1</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.60, (Istanbul), p.66.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.782-783, 840-841.

<sup>3</sup> For trading of guns into the Ottoman empire in the fourteenth century see Gábor Ágoston, 'Ottoman Artillery and European Military Technology in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries', forthcoming in *Acta Hungarica*. I should like to thank Dr Agoston for allowing me to read his article before publication. Colin Heywood, 'Notes on the production of fifteenth century Ottoman cannon', in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Islam and Science (Islamabad)*, (Islamabad, 1981). For the later Turkish arms industry see Colin Heywood, 'The activities of the State Canon Foundry (tophane-i 'amire) at Istanbul in the early sixteenth century according to an unpublished Turkish source' in *Orientalni Institut u Sarajevu*, vol. 30 (1980), pp.209-217.

western merchants and Muslim powers for the constant repetition of Papal bans against the export to the infidel of forbidden commodities, that is foodstuffs and war materials including metals, is an indicator of a persistent trade, conducted in defiance of Papal prohibition<sup>1</sup> and, one must assume, therefore profitable.

Iron, a major import from the west, and goods made from iron were one of the most important commodities traded by the Genoese<sup>2</sup>. Western merchants seem to have been largely unconcerned by religious scruple over this commerce. Pope Gregory XI was obliged, in 1373, to direct a threat of excommunication against those Christians who were trading iron to the Turks<sup>3</sup>. Papal permission, granted in 1363, to the Hospitallers to import foodstuffs from the Turks, contained the proviso that the Hospitallers should not, in return, trade war materials, including iron<sup>4</sup>. It is unlikely that the Hospitallers supplied their enemies with weapons, this clause being probably a stock phrase used by the Popes when granting such permission. However this does show how much of a threat the trade in war materials, largely metals, was considered to be by the Church.

Regardless of Papal sentiment, iron was sold throughout

---

<sup>1</sup> Governments too forbade such exports. The Venetians banned the export of iron and plough shears, 1389.vi.22 = *Monumenta Peloponesica*, no.51.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.782-783, 840-841.

<sup>3</sup> 1373.v.15 : Mollat, *Grégoire XI*, fasc.I, no.1798, p.252.

<sup>4</sup> 1363.vii.17 = Hayez, *Urbain V*, vol. 2, no.6420, p.207.

the Levant, in Lesser Armenia<sup>1</sup>, Candia<sup>2</sup>, Constantinople, Pera<sup>3</sup> and Caffa<sup>4</sup>, and in Turchia , in Antalya<sup>5</sup> and Bursa<sup>6</sup>. *Fil de fero* fetched one *hyperpyron* per *mazo* in Bursa in the late 1430s<sup>7</sup>, the price being comparable with that of for *fil de fero* on its way to Caffa in the same period<sup>8</sup>. In Caffa itself the price was slightly higher at around 1.2 *hyperpyra* per *mazo*<sup>9</sup>.

Iron, was not the only metal brought into the eastern Mediterranean, for lead too came in from the west, traded from Ragusa to Alexandria, to the Levant and into Syria<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.59.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.105.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.33. *fil de fero* was sold in Constantinople: 1436.vi.26 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.29, p.58, c.68, p.137; 1437.vi.23 = *ibid*, c.68, p.136, c.137, p.277.

<sup>4</sup> 1437.vii.1 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.79, p.160, c.68, p.137; 1437.ix.19 = *ibid*, c.79, p.160, c.68, p.137; 1437.xii.5 = *ibid*, c. 154, p.310, c.79, p.161; 1438.iv.29 = *ibid*, c.196, p.394, c.189, p.381; 1439.i.15 = c.367, p.737, seems to be coming back from Caffa: "per *fil de fero* che me fo tornà de Caffa"; 1439.iii.5 = c.325, p.652, also seems to be returning from Caffa: "*fil de fero barilli 3 dixè eser mazi 416 ..mandadome de Chafa*". This presumably means that it was not sold since there is an entry on the same day for expenses for the *barili* "andar e retornar".

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, p.58: sold by "peso del calbano, cioè la stadera".

<sup>6</sup> 1439.vii.8 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.325, p.652; 1439.ii.15 = *ibid*, c.348, p.698, c.325, p.653.

<sup>7</sup> 1439.iii.7 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.329, p.660, c.325, p.653.

<sup>8</sup> 1437.vii.1 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.79, p.160.

<sup>9</sup> 1437.xii.5 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.79, p.161.

<sup>10</sup> 1359.viii.30 : Kerkić, *Dubrovnik*, doc.241, p.203; 1410.vi.25 : *ibid*, doc.585, pp.259-260, refers to 1,230 pieces of lead at a weight of 143.465 Ragusan pounds;

and sold in the markets of Alexandria<sup>1</sup>, Candia, Pera and Constantinople<sup>2</sup> from where it was taken to Crete<sup>3</sup>. It sold too in Turchia and the Genoese traded it in Balat (Palatia) around the end of the fourteenth, beginning of the fifteenth centuries<sup>4</sup>.

Other metals were also shipped into the Levant. The Venetians traded tin into Alexandria and Syria<sup>5</sup> and, like iron and lead, it too appeared in the markets of the eastern Mediterranean, in Alexandria<sup>6</sup>, Beyrut<sup>7</sup>, Damascus<sup>8</sup>, Candia, Lesser Armenia and Constantinople and Pera, where tin "of every region" was sold<sup>9</sup>. The Genoese imported it into

---

1389.vi.23 : *ibid*, doc.392, p.228, refers to 231 pieces of lead weighing 23,500 lbs "ad pondus grossum Ventiarum", and to 714 pieces of lead weighing 100.945 lbs at the weight of Ragusa; 1377.xi.29 : *ibid*, doc.330, p.218.

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.70; 1347.viii.11 = Zucchello, doc.44, p.87.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, pp.105, 33. Lead of "every region" was sold in Pera and Constantinople. 1437.viii.27 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.95, p.192, c.50, p.101; 1438.iii.21 = *ibid*, c.83, p.168, c.62, p.125.

<sup>3</sup> 1438.iii.21 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.198, p.398, c.62, p.125.

<sup>4</sup> Piloti, p.72.

<sup>5</sup> 1400.viii.30 : Heers, 'Commercio', p.167, p.168.

<sup>6</sup> Heers, 'Commercio', p.205; 1347.viii.11 = Zucchello, doc.44, p.87.

<sup>7</sup> Heers, 'Commercio', p.205.

<sup>8</sup> Heers, 'Commercio', p.205.

<sup>9</sup> Pegolotti, pp.70, 105, 59, 33; 1436.ix.6 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.8, p.16, c.17, p.35, c.4, p.9 (this presumably was imported into Constantinople because the costs cited included unloading); 1436.xi.4 = *ibid*, c.9, p.18, c.17, p.35, c.4, p.9; 1436.ii.5 = *ibid*, c.50, p.100, c.50, p.101; 1436.ii.22 = *ibid*, c.50, p.100. c.170, p.343; 1436.iii.22 = *ibid*, c.49,



Balat<sup>1</sup> and it was also sold in Antalya<sup>2</sup>. Copper was brought into the Levant from Ragusa<sup>3</sup> and into Egypt from Venice, and sold in Alexandria<sup>4</sup>. Frescobaldi travelled from Venice to Alexandria on a ship whose cargo, loaded in Venice, included copper<sup>5</sup>.

It has been assumed that the trade in metals from the west into Turchia was of greater significance or volume than the sources appear to show, due to its illegality and consequent concealment combined with the haphazard survival of data. However the comparatively scanty evidence on the trading of metals may suggest that there was not in fact a large commerce in these commodities. If its illegality had been a factor of such importance, metals would presumably not have appeared at all in lists of commodities exported eastwards. Further, Turchia does not appear always to have been a sure market for metals, for on occasion imported

---

p.98, c.50, p.101; 1437.ix.19 = *ibid*, c.107, p.216, c.174, p.351, c.161, p.325; 1437.x.17 = *ibid*, c.89, p.180, c.107, p.217; 1437.x.17 = *ibid*, c.127, p.256, c.107, p.217; 1437.xi.7 = *ibid*, c.128, p.258, c.107, p.217; 1437.xii.5 = *ibid*, c.107, p.216, c.163, p.329; 1437.xii.28 = *ibid*, c.168, p.398, c.107, p.217; 1437.ii.4 = *ibid*, c.173, p.348, c.107, p.217; 1437.ii.8 = *ibid*, c.175, p.352, c.107, p.217; 1437.ii.10 = *ibid*, c.139, p.280, c.107, p.217; 1438.iii.4 = *ibid*, c.107, p.216, c.28, p.57.

<sup>1</sup> Piloti, pp.72.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>3</sup> 1389.vi.23 : Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, doc.392, p.228, refers to 4,864 pieces of fine copper weighing 60 000 lbs "ad pondus grossum venetiarum" and 140 pieces of copper weighing 1,541 lbs.

<sup>4</sup> 1347.viii.11 = Zucchello, doc.44, p.87.

<sup>5</sup> Frescobaldi, p.35.

metals remained unsold there<sup>1</sup>, indicating that Turchia was not suffering from a dearth of metals, such as would have attracted a large flow of imports.

The most striking indication that the trade in imported metals was not perhaps as great as has sometimes been assumed, was the fact that the Levant was in a position to export. One of the main commodities which the Venetian galleys carried home from Romania was its metals<sup>2</sup>. Anatolia was after all a metal producing and exporting country in its own right. It had metal resources, copper, iron and silver in particular<sup>3</sup>. There were silver mines at Bayburt, south-east of Trabzon, Gümüşhane (Argiron, south of Trabzon) and at Amasya<sup>4</sup>. Iron was produced around İzmir in Byzantine times<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 3 *barili* of *fil de fero* returning from Caffa, 1439.iii.5 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.325, p.652. 38 *mazi* of *fil de fero* imported into Bursa were left with Piero Palavexin, apparently unsold, 1439.ii.15 = *ibid*, c.348, p.698, c.325, p.653., c.388, p.788, c.348, p.699.

<sup>2</sup> Heers, 'Commercio', p.170. Both lead and copper were taken from Grecia back to Venice, *ibid*, p.169.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of mines in Anatolia and the Balkans see Vryonis, 'Question of the Byzantine Mines', pp.1-17.

<sup>4</sup> Marco Polo talked of a large silver mine at Bayburt

Polo, (Rugoff, 1961), p.51. Abu'l Fida refers to a silver mine at Amasya, Abu'l Fida, p.383, referring to the period pre 1321, which is the same one, according to Vryonis, 'Question of Byzantine mines', p.8, note 35, as that to which Eflaki refers in Amasya, Eflaki, II, p.380. Ibn Battuta too talks of silver mines at the town of Gümüş, Ibn Battuta, p.293. Al 'Umari, in the section in which he gives the information on Rum conveyed to him by Şeyh Haydar 'Uryan, says that Mongol officials controlled three silver mines, one near Luluh, one near Gümüş and one near Babert. Pure silver was being mined there. According to another informant of al 'Umari's, the towns where there were silver mines were Lulya (?) and Gümüş Sar. According to Balaban the mine from which silver came was Gümüş Şehir, but according to Uryan it was at Lulya (?), al-'Umari, pp.20, 31.

Copper was mined in north-east Anatolia in the region of Kastamonu, Sinop, Samsun and Osmancık and was of high quality for Chalcocondyles described it as second only to that of Iberia<sup>1</sup>. These copper resources were a bone of contention between local rulers and the expanding Ottoman state. The İsfendiyyar oğulları controlled the copper mines round Kastamonu in the fourteenth century. Later, control passed into the hands of the Ottomans when Bayezid I killed Süleyman Paşa, the İsfendiyyar oğulları ruler of Kastamonu, in 1391 and took over his territory<sup>2</sup>. Osmancık fell to him in the same period<sup>3</sup>, although he apparently failed to conquer Sinop<sup>4</sup>. He may however have exerted some control over the area for the ruler in Sinop, the son of Kötürüm Bayezid, former İsfendiyyar oğulları ruler, was in some way subordinate to him<sup>5</sup>. That Bayezid exercised influence over Sinop is supported by Chalcocondyles who refers to Bayezid taking over

---

<sup>5</sup> Ahrweiler, *Smyrne*, p.18.

<sup>1</sup> Chalcocondyles, p.498, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p.38, dates Süleyman's death to pre July 1391. Neşri dates Bayezid's conquest of Kastamonu to 795/1393, Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.77, (1949), p.320. Aşıkpaşazade dates it to between 797 and 798, Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.65, (Istanbul), p.72. Süleyman was trading copper with Genoese merchants, 1390.i.11 = ASG, Notai Cartulare 476, doc.26. A summary of this document is given in Balard et al (Paris, 1987), no.82, p.37.

<sup>3</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p.39; Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.58, (1949), p.322.

<sup>4</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p.40.

<sup>5</sup> Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.58, (1949), p.322; Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.65, (Istanbul), p.72.

the revenue of the copper mines there<sup>1</sup>. Bayezid also took over Samsun towards the end of his reign<sup>2</sup>. Amasya was seized in 1398 by Bayezid from Burhan al-Din<sup>3</sup>. After the Ottoman collapse of 1402 Kastamonu and Samsun reverted to İsfendiyar oğulları control while Amasya remained in Ottoman hands<sup>4</sup>. Mehmed I campaigned against the İsfendiyar oğulları and took Samsun<sup>5</sup>. The İsfendiyar oğulları ruler became subordinate to Mehmed, retaining land round Sinop but surrendering the copper revenues of Kastamonu to the Ottoman ruler<sup>6</sup>. In the period of civil strife in 1421-1422, the İsfendiyar ruler, Mübarizeddin, occupied Ottoman territory and, apparently, re-took the copper producing lands of Kastamonu<sup>7</sup>. In 1423<sup>8</sup> Murad II campaigned against the İsfendiyar oğulları, took

---

<sup>1</sup> Chalcocondyles, p.185, 5, Chalcocondyles, (Drako), I, pp.173-174. Chalcocondyles, p.489, 6, Chalcocondyles,(Drako), II, p.242 says that when Mehmed II conquered Sinop in the middle fifteenth century, the annual tax income from the mines was 50,000 gold pieces.

<sup>2</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p.41, dates this to, probably, 1398. His conquest of Samsun appears in Neşri at the same time as the conquest of Kastamonu and Osmançık in 795/1393, Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.58, (1949), p.322.

<sup>3</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p.40. Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.77, dates the conquest of Amasya to 794/1392.

<sup>4</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p.63.

<sup>5</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), pp.79-80, (Istanbul), pp.89-90, Neşri, (Menzîl Codex), p.145, (1949), pp.540-542.

<sup>6</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p.88. Dr Imber dates Mehmed I's campaign to, probably, the second half of 1417, p.88 and note 23.

<sup>7</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, pp.95-96.

<sup>8</sup> Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p.95, gives this date, although Vryonis, 'Question of Byzantine Mines', p.10, dates the Ottoman conquest of Kastamonu to 1425.

Kastamonu and set the copper furnaces to work. The İsfendiyyar oğulları ruler was once more reduced to vassal status in the area of Sinop<sup>1</sup>. Mehmed II continued to control the copper mines of the area, taking Sinop in 1461<sup>2</sup>. During his reign the area of Kastamonu was a producer of "infinite" amounts of copper, extracted from quarries and mines there<sup>3</sup>. Its importance as a source of copper at this period is indicated by its being sold in *appalto* to two people, one of whom controlled the export via the sea and the other that via the land route. A good reserve of copper was always kept in the treasury<sup>4</sup>. In the course of their conquests the Ottomans also took over other mines in the Balkans. After the battle of Kosovo in 1389 for example, the mines of that region fell into Ottoman hands<sup>5</sup>.

The Turks therefore had at their disposal their own metal resources. These resources, particularly copper, were exported from Turchia westwards, a trade in which, according to Professor Balard, the Genoese played a dominant role<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), pp.92-93, (Istanbul), pp.104-105, Neşri, (Menzil Codex), pp.153-154, (1957), pp.574-576.

<sup>2</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), pp.147-149, (Istanbul), pp.154-155, Neşri, (Menzil Codex), pp.190-192, (1957), pp.740-746. Aşıkpaşazade specifies that the income from the copper furnaces allocated to the Ottoman ruler was to be used if required.

<sup>3</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, p.67.

<sup>4</sup> Jacopo di Promontorio, p.67: "de quali rami ne tiene sempre una ampla torre piena loco thesauri". Copper from this area was used to mint money.

<sup>5</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.58, (Istanbul), p.64.

<sup>6</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.783.

Lead was exported westwards and appears on ships of western merchants as an export commodity<sup>1</sup>. In the inventory of the goods of Bartolomeo Vignoso, for example, items which were being sent west included 50 *kantars* of lead<sup>2</sup>. Thessalonika, under the Ottomans, exported lead which went via Candia to Alexandria<sup>3</sup> as did lead exported from Constantinople<sup>4</sup>.

Anatolia was a producer and exporter of copper which the Italian merchants bought in large quantities<sup>5</sup>. In 1403 Petro Falacha planned to sail from Caffa to Turchia to load copper and other goods<sup>6</sup>. Merchants also went from Pera to Sinop for Copper<sup>7</sup>. Turkish copper may have been exported to Barcelona. In 1381 a ship mastered by Martino Umcentii and Alnardo Belegerio, both of Barcelona, was to sail from Chios to Theologos and from there to Alexandria or Beirut before going to Barcelona. It could load, 'among other things, copper in these places. The document does not specify which of the ports copper was to be loaded in but it could well have been

---

<sup>1</sup> 1396.v.31 : Heers, *'Commercio'*, p.173. 191 pieces of lead are listed on a ship arriving in Genoa from Romania.

<sup>2</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.783.

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, p.63.

<sup>4</sup> 1437.ix.4 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.62, p.124, c.95, p.193. Lead was traded in Constantinople, 1437.viii.27 = *ibid*, c.50, p.101, c.95, p.192.

<sup>5</sup> Ashtor, *'Pagamento in contanti e baratto'*, p.370 and note 3.

<sup>6</sup> 1403.xi.28 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, ff.40r-41r.

<sup>7</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.784, note 69 (1402).

Theologos<sup>1</sup>. Copper was sold in Antalya and although Pegolotti does not specify where the copper came from, it may, in light of the evidence of Turkish copper production, have been produced in Turchia<sup>2</sup>.

Turks themselves traded in copper with the Genoese. The İsfendiyyar oğulları ruler Süleyman Paşa traded copper with Genoese merchants. In 1390, Constantino de Groto, *burgensis* of Pera, brought a case for damages before the Genoese Podestà in Pera, against Dagnano Spinulla and Petro de Groto, *burgenses* of Pera, *fideicommissors* of Raffaele Capello, also a *burgensis* of Pera. In the case, Constantino claimed that he and Raffaele Capello had made a *società* concerning 16,000 lbs of copper at the weight of the lord Solimambasa Turchi, lord of Kastamonu (Süleyman Paşa, the İsfendiyyar oğulları ruler). This weight was the equivalent of c.4,000 *kantars* of Pera. Constantino bought the copper from Süleyman Paşa for 476,000 silver *aspers* of Kastamonu. Raffaele promised to settle this sum with Constantino. But when Constantino asked Daganano and Petro for the money, they had not paid it, thus resulting in a loss to Constantino<sup>3</sup>. In 1404 Cagi Mostaffa Turk of Bursa (ie Hacı Mustafa) acknowledged payment from the

---

<sup>1</sup> 1381.ii.15 = ASG, Cartulare 175, ff.110v-111r. Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.784 note 72, in reference to this document, talks of Catalan merchants going to Chios in order to get copper for Alexandria. The document however makes it clear that the merchants, sailing from Chios, were to load copper in either Theologos or Beirut or Alexandria.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>3</sup> 1390.i.11 = ASG, Notai Cartulare 476, doc.26. A summary of this document is given in Balard et al, *Documents*, no.82, p.37

Jew Elias Sacerdotus for copper which he had handed over to Elias<sup>1</sup>.

Much copper was sold in Constantinople<sup>2</sup> and was exported from there to Candia, Venice, Messina and Saragosa, Damascus, Beyrut and Alexandria<sup>3</sup>. While some of this copper came from

---

<sup>1</sup> 1404.xii.31 = ASG, Notaio Gregorio Panissario, Sc.37, filze I, doc.48. These two merchants were also involved in a transaction over mastic which Elias was to hand over to Mustafa, 1404.xii.31 = *ibid*, doc.49.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, pp. 35, 59; 1436.ii.17 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.38, p.76, c.39, p.79; 1436.xii.3 = *ibid*, c.38, p.76, c.38, p.77; 1436.xii.3 = *ibid*, c.39, p.78, c.38, p.77; 1436.xii.4 = *ibid*, c.39, p.78, c.40, p.81; 1437.iii.15 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110, c.55, p.111, c.17, p.35; 1437.vi.7 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110, c.40, p.81; 1437.vi.12,17 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110, c.36, p.73; 1437.vii.5,15,27 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110, c.75, p.153; 1437.vii.12 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110, c.29, p.59; 1437.iii.15, iv.22 = *ibid*, c.56, p.112, c.55, p.111; 1437.iii.15 = *ibid*, c.56, p.112, c.4, p.9; 1437.vi.7, vii.6 = *ibid*, c.56, p.112, c.72, p.147; 1437.vi.7 = *ibid*, c.72, p.146, c.55, p.111, c.17, p.35; 1437.vii.4 = *ibid*, c.72, p.146, c.5, p.11; 1437.vii.5 = *ibid*, c.72, p.146, c.74, p.151; 1437.vi.29 = *ibid*, c.76, p.154, c.74, p.151; 1437.vii.3 = *ibid*, c.81, p.164, c.47, p.95; 1437.vii.4 = *ibid*, c.81, p.164, c.81, p.165; 1437.viii.7, ix.7 = *ibid*, c.81, p.164, c.91, p.185; 1437.vii.8 = *ibid*, c.83, p.168, c.55, p.111; 1437.vii.8 = *ibid*, c.83, p.168, c.80, p.163; 1437.viii.7 = *ibid*, c.91, p.184, c.45, p.91; 1437.ix.26 = *ibid*, c.120, p.242, c.119, p.241; 1437.x.31 = *ibid*, c.130, p.262, c.101, p.205, c.141, p.284, c.101, p.205; 1437.xi.15 = *ibid*, c.130, p.262, c.141, p.285; 1437.x.31 = *ibid*, c.141, p.284, c.101, p.205, c.137, p.277, c.121, p.245, c.100, p.203; 1438.vii.8 = *ibid*, c.218, p.438, c.218, p.439; 1438.vii.9 = *ibid*, c.218, p.438, c.120, p.243; 1438.vii.18 = *ibid*, c.218, p.438, c.169, p.341; 1438.viii.14 = *ibid*, c.227, p.456, c.35, p.71; 1438.viii.14 = *ibid*, c.227, p.456, c.220, p.443; 1438.xii.7 = *ibid*, c.291, p.584, c.291, p.585; 1438.xii.5 = *ibid*, c.291, p.584, c.176, p.355; 1439.vi.6 = *ibid*, c.331, p.664, c.133, p.269; 1439.ix. = *ibid*, c.365, p.732, c.365, p.733; 1439.ii.25 = *ibid*, c.401, p.804, c.401, p.805; 1439.ii.26 = *ibid*, c.401, p.804, c.387, p.777.

<sup>3</sup> 1436.xii.4 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.39, p.78, c.40, p.81 (Messina, Saragosa); 1437.iv.22 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110, c.55, p.111 (Venice); 1437.xi.17 = *ibid*, c.142, p.286, c.143, p.289, c.137, p.277, c.121, p.245, c.100, p.203 (Venice); 1437.xi.17 = *ibid*, c.117, p.236, c.142, p.287; 1438.xii.7 = *ibid*, c.291, p.584, c.291, p.585 (Beyrut); 1437.iii.15, iv.22 = *ibid*, c.56, p.112 and c.55, p.111 (Candia, Alexandria);



the Balkans<sup>1</sup>, it seems highly possible that much of the copper on sale on the Constantinople market came from Anatolia<sup>2</sup>. Badoer refers to settling copper sales after the return of ships from the Black Sea, perhaps indicating that copper was being brought into Constantinople from the Kastamonu region<sup>3</sup>. Merchants did after all sail with cargoes<sup>e</sup> of copper from Sinop to Pera<sup>4</sup>. The copper referred to by Piloti being sold "en piatines" in Constantinople<sup>5</sup> may too well have originated in Anatolia for Turchia was listed together with Tana, Caffa, Trabzon and Greece, as the places from which the commodities listed by Piloti came.

In conclusion, it seems at least possible to suggest that the absence of references to a large volume of metal trading from the west into Turchia was due not to its illegality and gaps in extant data, but to the reality that there was no such volume. Anatolia did not necessarily need to import large quantities of metal, or at least not those

---

1437.vi.7, vii.6 = *ibid*, c.56, p.112, c.72, p.147 (Candia, Alexandria); 1436.ii.22 = *ibid*, c.38, p.76, c.17, p.35 (Messina); 1437.iv.22 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110, c.17, p.35 (Alexandria); 1437.viii.2 = *ibid*, c.89, p.180, c.83, p.169 (Candia).

<sup>1</sup> 1438.vii.8 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.218, p.438, c.120, p.243, "rame in tornexi vlachesci".

<sup>2</sup> Both Thiriet, *Romanie Vénitienne*, p.427 and Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.783, note 68, say that Badoer dealt in copper from Kastamonu and reference to Badoer, *Libro*, c.56. This reference however, although dealing with copper, does not mention Kastamonu.

<sup>3</sup> 1439.vi.6 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.331, p.664 and c.133, p.269; 1437.iv.22 = *ibid*, c.55, p.110, c.55, p.111.

<sup>4</sup> Balard, *Romanie Génoise*, II, p.784, note 69 (1402).

<sup>5</sup> Piloti, pp.62-63.

which it produced itself. In the case of the arms trade, perhaps weapons were not traded in concealed quantities but what was imported was technology and expertise. The cannons under Mehmed II which fired so effectively at the walls of Constantinople were cast by a Hungarian renegade<sup>1</sup>.

Precious metals too were traded in Anatolia. Silver and gold were traded as luxury items. These were, after all, items much sought after as tokens of wealth. At the end of the thirteenth century, the Byzantine general Philanthopenos sent silver and gold as part of the spoils of his fighting in Asia Minor back to Constantinople<sup>2</sup>. Around the same period, the Tekfur of Bilecük sent Köse Mihail to 'Osman to invite him to his wedding. Köse Mihail went bearing gifts of gold and silversmiths' tools<sup>3</sup>. In the 1330s, Mehmed Aydınoğlu, the ruler of Aydın, regarded silver as among those items suitable to give as presents to the traveller ibn Battuta<sup>4</sup>. He also gave silver pieces to ibn Battuta's companions on their departure<sup>5</sup>. There were gold and silver plates and spoons at the palace at Birgi<sup>6</sup>. Umur Aydın oğlu presented Şeyh İzz al-Dīn with silver vessels<sup>7</sup>. At the wedding in 783/1381-2 between Bayezid and the daughter of the emir of Germiyan

---

<sup>1</sup> Dukas, (Bonn), pp.247-248; (Bucharest), pp.307, 309.

<sup>2</sup> Planoudes, *Epistulae*, letter 78, p.99.

<sup>3</sup> Neşri, (*Menzil Codex*), p.30; (1949), p.98.

<sup>4</sup> ibn Battuta, p.302.

<sup>5</sup> ibn Battuta, p.307.

<sup>6</sup> ibn Battuta, p.304.

<sup>7</sup> ibn Battuta, p.311.

there were gold and silver trays, silver ewers and pots, and gold coins<sup>1</sup>. Around the same period Aşıkpaşazade makes reference to silver and gold trays and bowls taken as spoil from a captured castle<sup>2</sup>. At the end of the fourteenth century, the Byzantine emperor sent 100 fish full of gold and silver to the Ottoman ruler Bayezid<sup>3</sup>. Even if this is more myth than reality, it still indicates the importance of gold and silver as tokens of wealth and power.

Silver and gold were sold in Anatolia. Silver was traded in the markets of Antalya and in Theologos where it appeared in pieces and bullion<sup>4</sup>. Spun gold was also sold in Antalya<sup>5</sup>. In 1438 "chanele 3 d'oro filado" was sold in Edirne, from the ten "chanele" sent there. The figure entered is 9 *hyperpyra*, presumably the amount for which they were sold there<sup>6</sup>. The remaining 7 *chanele* of "oro filado" were sent to Constantinople from Edirne by Pipo de Jachomo<sup>7</sup>. The ten *chanele*, weighing ten ounces of Constantinople, were sent by Asalon, son of Cain, a Jew, and were valued at three *hyperpyra* per ounce<sup>8</sup>. Spun gold of every region came to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.53, (Istanbul), p.57; Neşri, (Menzl Codex), p.56, (1949), p.206.

<sup>2</sup> Aşıkpaşazade (Giese), p.55; (Istanbul), p.60.

<sup>3</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.61; (Istanbul), pp.67-8.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, pp.56, 58.

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, p.58.

<sup>6</sup> 1438. x.22 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.230, p.462, c.89, p.181.

<sup>7</sup> 1438.x.22 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.113, p.228, c.89, p.181.

<sup>8</sup> 1437.xii.17 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.89, p.180, c.113, p.115.

markets of Pera and Constantinople where spun gold of Lucca, Genoa and Provence was sold<sup>1</sup>.

Silver items seem to have been traded in Turchia. In 1358 Musa, emir of Menteşe, promised to pay the Duca di Candia, Pietro Badoer, the remainder owed for silver/a silver object (*argentei*) of the Comune of Crete which Musa's father had received from Francisco Blanco when he was in Balat (Palatia) on negotiations for the Comune<sup>2</sup>. In 1381 there was a dispute in Chios between two merchants from Barcelona and the Barcelonese masters of a ship. One of the matters of dispute concerned nine bales of cloth and some silver. The arbitrators declared that this matter had to be settled in Barcelona<sup>3</sup>. As this ship was on its way to Theologos and as the item together with silver in dispute was cloth, something much traded into Theologos, it seems possible that the silver may have been destined for Theologos. In Chios no exemption was granted for silver or gold from the *gabella* of 0.5% charged on all merchandise carried by sea to Chios, Mitylene, Rhodes, Old and New Phokaea, Caffa and all places in Turchia<sup>4</sup>. Gold and silver could therefore have been imported into Anatolia from Chios, particularly as one of the other items specially mentioned as not being granted exemption was

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.36.

<sup>2</sup> 1358.x.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1358/1359M, clause 5, p.218. The amount paid was 800 gold *florins* but this sum included a settlement for damages by Turks against Cretan subjects on the *grippa* of Leone Marmara.

<sup>3</sup> 1381.ii.15 = ASG, Cartulare 175, ff.110v-111r.

<sup>4</sup> 1408.ii, *Argenti, Chios*, I, p.422.

soap, an import into that region.

Apart from importing, Turchia also exported gold and silver. In 1377 Dutch gold (*aurepelium*) was imported from Balat (Palatia) into Genoa where it was taxed<sup>1</sup>.

There was thus a circular movement of metals round the eastern Mediterranean, flowing both into and out of Anatolia. Although it is generally assumed that the volume of metal traded into Turchia was larger than suggested by extant evidence, it seems possible at least to suggest that this was not in fact so and that lack of evidence in this case is due to there being a lack of anything to evidence. On the other hand, any conclusion must remain tentative as there is very little extant data from which one can gauge the extent of this trade or the details of its operation.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1377.viii.19 = Day, *Douanes*, II, p.874.

## SECTION 6: WINE

Despite religious prohibition, Turks in the fourteenth and fifteenth century drank wine and even the pious Umur Aydınoğlu was a wine drinker. While in the beylik of Saruhan before setting out on gaza, he drank wine with the sons of Saruhan, Atmaz and Orhan<sup>1</sup> and wine was drunk at the feast celebrating the defeat of the *Tekfur* of Eğriboz (Euboea, Negroponte)<sup>2</sup>. When, in response to Kantakuzenos's request for help, Umur went to Dimetoka (Didymoteichon), Kantakuzenos laid on a feast for him such that the wine flowed in abundance. Umur however passed the time more piously in prayer<sup>3</sup>.

Wine was therefore one of the important commodities in the trade with Turchia. It was a commodity of great significance in the trade of the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea being imported from southern Italy, Provence, Crete and Cyprus, famous for its wines in the Middle Ages. One of the most sought after wines was Malvoisie, a sweet wine originally made for export in Crete. The name, which in English became Malmsey, was used by this period to mean a type of wine rather than specifying its origin, namely from Monemvasie (Malvasia)<sup>4</sup>. For the Genoese wine was "un des produits de base du commerce gènois en Romanie" and one in

---

<sup>1</sup> Enveri, p.60.

<sup>2</sup> Enveri, p.70.

<sup>3</sup> Enveri, p.95.

<sup>4</sup> Piloti was granted the privilege of importing to Alexandria five *bottes* of Malvoisie a month by the Mamluk Sultan Faraj, Piloti, pp.102-103.

which they made considerable profits<sup>1</sup>. Their trade in wine extended beyond Romania to the lands of the Mongols with whom they used it as a means of payment and exchange for goods such as spices, silks and precious stones which they exported to the West.

The wine trade in Anatolia was two-way for at the same time as importing wine Turchia was also a producer. Vines were grown in Asia Minor and both grapes and wine were exported. Ibn Battuta in his description of Theologos referred to the vineyards along both banks of the river<sup>2</sup>. Black dried grapes were exported from Balat (Palatia) and the surrounding area at the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries<sup>3</sup>. Grapes were also exported from Gelibolu (Gallipoli) and imported into Constantinople from Turchia<sup>4</sup>. Seven bote of grapes (zebibo), weighing 63 *kantar*, were sold in Samsun (Simiso) at 62 and 72 *aspers* per *kantar* for a total of 4,210 *aspers* which was equivalent to 221.5 *hyperpyra*<sup>5</sup>. They were loaded onto the ship of Galeoto Lumelin (Lomelini) and the expenses associated with their shipment listed as 137 *hyperpyra* 17 *karati*<sup>6</sup>. These grapes were from Lichomidia (?Nicomedia, Izmit) and were sold by a

---

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *La Romanie Génoise*, II, pp.845-846.

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Battuta, p.309.

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, p.61, "cebibo noires, qui sont roisons de quaresme".

<sup>4</sup> Piloti, pp.62-3. The raisins were "armelins", a type of Egyptian raisin.

<sup>5</sup> 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.44, p.89.

<sup>6</sup> 1436.i.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.44, p.88, c.43, p.87.

Turk called Amet (Ahmed) who bartered them for cloth<sup>1</sup>. The value of the grapes is given here as two *hyperpyra* per *kantar*, a total of 127 *hyperpyra*. This is less than their sale value in Samsun which was between 3.3 and 3.8 *hyperpyra* per *kantar*, calculating at the rate of 19 Samsun *aspers* per *hyperpyron*. Thus the market value of the grapes was higher than that with which they were credited for the purpose of bartering.

As well as exporting grapes, Anatolia also produced and exported wine. Much of the wine production was probably in the hands of Christians, for Timurtaş appears to have forbidden Christians from selling wine when he was Mongol governor in the 1320s<sup>2</sup>. Both Makre (Meğri, Fetiye) and Ania (Kadı Kalesi) were wine producing areas in the thirteenth century and the Venetians exported wine from there<sup>3</sup> while the Byzantines taxed the export of wine from Ania (Kadı Kalesi)<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1436.i.14 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.43, p.86, c.42, p.85; c.42, p.84, c.13, p.27.

<sup>2</sup> Vryonis, *Decline*, p.225, citing Karim al-Din Mahmud, a contemporary of the events, who stated that Timurtaş imposed what ibn Arabi had advised the Sultan Kaykaus I (1211-20). Among what ibn Arabi advised was that Christians not be allowed to sell wine.

<sup>3</sup> 1278.iii = ASV in Tafel - Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, no.370, p.159 fl: Giovanni Bembo went c. 1275 from Negroponte to "Macrem de Turchia" and loaded wine and grain, p.196-197; Michael de Verona sailed to Ania about the same time to load wine, p.239; Nicolao Dente and Filippo Bono, again around the same period, too went to Ania for wine, p.254.

<sup>4</sup> 1278.iii = ASV in Tafel - Thomas, *Urkunden*, no.370, p.239, Michael de Verona complained of being made to pay *comerchium* by the Emperor's officials in Ania of 18 *hyperpyra* for two *viatici* (fuisse *comerclatum* per *comerclarios*, qui ibi erant [ie in Ania] ... pro duobus *viaticis* in XVIII *yperperis*). Ibid, p.254, Nicolao Dente and Filippo Bono



Wine from Trilia, Incir Liman (Paralime), Liminia and Giresun (Kerasunt) and was sold in Pera and Caffa<sup>1</sup>. Wine from Trilia was also sold in Tana<sup>2</sup>. Cappadocia too was a famous wine producing area in the thirteenth century and the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II is reputed to have drunk the wine of Beyşehir while campaigning in that area<sup>3</sup>. It seems possible that wine was sold in Aydın to Latins as a clause in the 1348 treaty between Hızır and the *Sancta Unio* allowed any of its galleys to come to the beylik and sell and buy anything that was necessary for provisioning, such as bread, wine, meat and all other victuals, without paying any *comerclum* or other tax<sup>4</sup>. As the clause specifies goods, among them wine, necessary for provisioning, it seems that these goods were bought by the galleys rather than sold.

Apart from producing and exporting wine, Anatolia was an importer, presumably of better quality wine than the home grown product. The Genoese were involved in this trade,

---

complained of the same thing, also in Ania (*comerclatis in Ania per comerclarios domini Imperatoris ....dixere dicti iudices, debere reddi VIII yperpera, que solverint pro ipso comercio*).

<sup>1</sup> Balard, *La Romanie Génoise*, II, p.844.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.24.

<sup>3</sup> Vryonis, *Decline*, p.483; Babinger, *Mahomet*, p.399.

<sup>4</sup> 1348.viii.18 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1348A, clause 19, p.209: *omnes gallee sancte unionis possent uenire per tota loca nostra et portus, emere, uenere totum illud, quod erit necessarium illis pro reffrescamento ipsarum, uidelicet panem, uinum, carnes et omnia alia uictualia, non soluendo aliquod comerclum nec aliquod ius dominationis.*

shipping wine from Naples into Theologos<sup>1</sup>. Greeks too traded wine for in 1437 Dimitri Argiti de Chandia imported it into Gelibolu<sup>2</sup>.

Wine imports into Anatolia in the fourteenth century were taxed. Wine brought into Theologos paid one gold *florin* per *botte di Napoli*<sup>3</sup>, while in Menteşe wine was taxed at the rate of 50 *aspers* per *vegete*, the rate remaining unaltered throughout the fourteenth and into the fifteenth centuries<sup>4</sup>. In the 1337 treaty between Hızır of Aydın and the Duca di Candia all goods were exempt from import tax (*dacium*, although exported goods paid export customs at the rate of either 6% or 4%) for Venetians except soap and wine. Wine was to be charged at the rate of one *florin* per each *vegeta de Neapoli*<sup>5</sup>. In the 1353 treaty between Hızır and Marino Morosini, the Duca di Candia, wine was taxed at the rate of one *florin* per *buta de mena*<sup>6</sup>. It may be significant that under the treaty of 1337 the goods upon which import tax exemption specifically was not to apply were soap and wine but not cloth, a major western import. This perhaps may be

---

<sup>1</sup> Musso, *Navigazione*, pp.169-70.

<sup>2</sup> 1437.iii.31 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.125, p.252.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.56.

<sup>4</sup> 1337.pre iv. = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, Doc.1375M, clauses 22, p.222, 28, p.223; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 22, pp.236-7.

<sup>5</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 7, p.191.

<sup>6</sup> 1358.iv.7 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1353A, clause 20, p.214.

due to the fact that, presumably, neither soap nor wine were imported in the quantities that cloth was and that therefore the Venetians were prepared to give way over an import tax on these commodities, but were unwilling to see a similar tax applied to cloth.

Wine was also taxed in Chios and New Phokaea. From 1351 to the beginning of the fifteenth century, the rate in Chios was half a *florin* per *vegete*<sup>1</sup>. In New Phokaea at the beginning of the fifteenth century, a *commerchium* of four *florins* per *vegete* was charged<sup>2</sup>. Working on the basis of 1 *ducat* to c. 23 *aspers* for the 1330s and to c. 31 *aspers* at the end of the fourteenth century<sup>3</sup>, one sees that for the first half of the fourteenth century the tax was c.23 *aspers* or 1 *ducat* in Aydın, 50 *aspers* or c.2 *ducats* in Menteşe and 11.5 *aspers* or 0.5 of a *ducat* in Chios. For the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth the rate in Menteşe was 50 *aspers* or c.1.5 *ducats*, in Chios c.15.5 *aspers* or .5 of a *ducat* and in New Phokaea c.124 *aspers* or 4 *ducats*. These figures show that the rate in Menteşe was considerably more than that in Aydın while that

---

<sup>1</sup> 1404.xii.15 = Argenti, Chios, II, pp.161, 164, 165, 166; 1405.xi.26 = *ibid*, p.172.

<sup>2</sup> 1405.ii.14 = Argenti, Chios, II, p.171.

<sup>3</sup> The comparative rates are based on al-'Umari's rate of 1 *akçe* to 0.75 of a *dirhem*, and the rate given in a court decision in Crete of 1 *ducat* per 30 or 32 *akçe*, see Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, pp.140-141 and Şanchi, *Regestes*, n.354, p.90. Zachariadou calculated the duty in Menteşe as 1.66 *florins* for 50 *akçe* in comparison with the charged in Aydın. However as the rate given for Aydın appears in the treaty of 1353 it would seem better to calculate at the rate based on al-'Umari rather than that for the end of the century, see Zachariadou, *ibid*, p.157.

charged in New Phokaea was extremely high in comparison with that of Chios and the beyliks. The Chian rate was the best being substantially less than that of the other three places. It is interesting that the rates both in Menteşe and Chios remained the same in the fourteenth and early fifteenth century.

Imported wine went through the hands of tax farmers in the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın. According to Pegolotti wine brought into Theologos was subject to *appalto* or *gabella*<sup>1</sup>. In Aydın wine was subject to *appalto* before 1337 for a clause in the treaty of that year between Menteşe and the Duca di Candia stated that if the emir of Aydın, Hızır, made an agreement with the Venetians under which wine, soap and alum remained subject to *appalto* then Ibrahim, emir of Menteşe, was at liberty to impose *appalto* on alum, though not on wine and soap, in Balat (Palatia) only. If Hızır removed *appalto* from alum, wine and soap, Ibrahim would not impose it on alum<sup>2</sup>. Aydın did in fact lift *appalto* for the Venetians from wine and soap in 1337<sup>3</sup> though not from alum which was exempted under the treaty of 1358<sup>4</sup>. The linking here of commercial policy in Menteşe with that of Aydın is interesting, showing, as it does, that the beyliks were, to

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.56.

<sup>2</sup> 1337.pre iv. = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 28, pp.199-200.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192.

<sup>4</sup> 1358.x.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1358/1359M, clause 8, p.218.

some extent, in competition with each other over attracting western merchants while at the same time being aware that neither beylik need concede much more than the other. The fact that Menteşe was prepared to maintain the exemption for Venetian subjects from *appalto* on wine and soap, regardless of what Aydın did, while maintaining the right to impose it on alum indicates that the income from alum was more important, as one would expect, than that from either wine or soap. The concession was thus worth making, not loosing the state much income.

In Menteşe, Venetian merchants continued to be able to trade in wine without the imposition of *appalto* throughout the fourteenth and into the fifteenth centuries<sup>1</sup>. The clause in the 1337 treaty, repeated in subsequent treaties, reads "Item promittimus et volumus quod vinum, sapo, caseus et telle, cera, pelamen et alumen et omnia alia mercimonia, quae adduxerint Cretenses vel Veneti vel alii fideles comunis Venetorum vel voluerint de terris nostris extrahere, non debeant poni in apalto, excepto vino quod volumus quod solvat aspros quinquaginta pro qualibet vegete et sic pro ratione solvatur pro caratello et non aliud". From this clause it is clear that wine is not to be subject to *appalto* for it would hardly have been listed only to be excluded immediately from the list of exempted commodities. The clause also emphasises that *appalto* was not in itself a tax, for a tax rate applied

---

<sup>1</sup> 1337.pre iv. = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198; *ibid*, Doc.1375M, clauses 22, p.222, 28, p.223. 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231 and doc.1403M, DVL, clause 22, p.231. Doc.1403M refers to *gabella* and doc.1403M, DVL to *datium*.

to wine only is given here<sup>1</sup>.

In Chios and New Phokaea too, wine was subject to the *gabella* in the fourteenth and at the beginning of the fifteenth centuries. In the report of Gregorio di Marsupino to Marshal Boucicault in 1404 dealing with tax in Chios and the rights of the Maona in New Phokaea, reference is made to "cabelle" imposed in Chios on wine imported into the island (*forensis delati ad ciuitatem et Insulam chii*). This *gabella* existed also in 1351<sup>2</sup>. In an order from Marshal Boucicault in response to Gregorio di Marsupino's report reference is made to the "cabelle seu Introytus" of half a florin per *vegete* of wine<sup>3</sup>.

It has been stated that the emirs of Menteşe and Aydın reserved the wine trade as a monopoly<sup>4</sup>. However it may be that the emirs had a right of state intervention rather than placing the commodity under a monopoly. It certainly was subject to restrictions. In Menteşe in 1331 the emir had the right to first pick of any wine imported into the beylik. Merchants were permitted to unload their wine and take it to "domum suam". If the *namatari* of the emir wanted to buy the wine and came to an agreement with the vendor, the *namatari* had ten days in which to pay for the wine and take possession

---

<sup>1</sup> For *appalto* see chapter II.

<sup>2</sup> 1404.xii.15 = Argenti, *Chios*, II, pp.161, 164, 165, 166. The rate is repeated in 1405.xi.26 = *ibid*, p.172.

<sup>3</sup> 1404.xii.16 = Argenti, *Chios*, II, p.167. This phrase is repeated in a list of taxes paid in New Phokaea, 1405.ii.14 = Argenti, *ibid*, p.170.

<sup>4</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.171.

of it. If the deal had not been settled by the end of this period the vendor was then free to sell his wine as he wished<sup>1</sup>. The meaning of the title *namatari* is unknown. Professor Zachariadou has suggested that it may come from the Persian *name*(letter) and *-dar* (bearer)<sup>2</sup> while Dr Zhukov has proposed that it is derived from the Greek word *nama* which, he says, was used in Byzantium for communion wine and, which he suggests may in colloquial speech well have meant wine in general<sup>3</sup>. The word *nama* however meant something poured or flowing. Porphyrogenitos, when referring to the communion, used the word *nama* for wine, but its significance in this context was that it was something poured, a libation, not that it was wine<sup>4</sup>. Therefore this explanation of the title *namatari* is not credible. As an alternative derivation, Dr Zhukov has pointed out that it might be a distortion of the title *amaldar-i emir* or tax farmer<sup>5</sup>. This however seems unlikely as in this case it would be hard to explain the initial *n* of the word *namatari*, particularly in view of the word *amalim* used in the treaty of 1407 between Menteşe and Crete which seems to be the Latin form of the Arabic *`amal*<sup>6</sup>.

In any case it is clear that the *namatari* was a state

---

<sup>1</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 13, pp.188-9.

<sup>2</sup> See Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.135 and n.577.

<sup>3</sup> К А Zhukov, *Эгейские Эмираты*, p.84.

<sup>4</sup> Porphyrogenitos, *De Ceremoniis*, I, p.134, 25.

<sup>5</sup> К А Zhukov, *Эгейские Эмираты*, p.84.

<sup>6</sup> See chapter II, p.43.

official and that in Menteşe the state could, if it so wished, intervene in transactions over wine. If, however, the emir was not interested in buying, any restriction over sale was lifted. This is the same process as that employed by the emir of Menteşe over other goods imported into his state. If the emir wished to buy any merchandise bought into the beylik by Venetian merchants he could purchase within three days, provided there was an agreement with the merchant over the price. If however no agreement was reached within this period the merchant was then free to sell his goods to whomsoever he wished<sup>1</sup>. This seems more a right of intervention in the market than a state monopoly.

However monopolies were used by the later Ottomans who imposed state monopolies on various commodities, as they did for example on timber in the second half of the fifteenth century when the monopoly on the timber trade between Antalya and Egypt was farmed out to individuals<sup>2</sup>. Wine may have been a monopoly in Aydın for Hızır granted the monopoly on selling wine to merchants in Theologos (Ephesos) to the widow of the last Byzantine governor there who kept a tavern on the outskirts of the city<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, clause 4, p.188.

<sup>2</sup> Halil İnalcık, 'Bursa and the Commerce of the Levant', p.47.

<sup>3</sup> Ludolphus de Sudheim.



## SECTION 7: OTHER COMMODITIES

Certain commodities appear to have been dominant in Genoese-Turkish trade. Thus alum, cloth, grain and slaves in particular were commodities of major importance in the commerce between Turchia and the western states. Other items formed part of this commerce but have left fewer traces in the extant documentation. Among them was soap, a luxury commodity in the trade between the west Mediterranean and the Levant. Its manufacture dates back to Roman times when the process used in its production was described by Pliny the Elder<sup>1</sup>. In the fourteenth century, good soap for trade to the Levant had to be supple and made in small pieces while the boxes in which it came had to be so small that there were three to a *migliaro*<sup>2</sup>. Nearly 200 years later, Venetian soap was still preferred to that produced in Anatolia, which, being made of tallow (*sego*), was not good. For this reason Turkish women washed their cloths with Venetian soap<sup>3</sup>.

Soap was traded into the Levant<sup>4</sup> by western merchants who brought it from Venice, Ancona, Gaeta, Messina and Puglia, Cyprus and Rhodes to the markets of Constantinople

---

<sup>1</sup> Pliny the Elder, bk.28, ch.51, para.191.

<sup>2</sup> 1345.v.26 = Zucchello, no.15, p.38: "El savone che mandate si fate che sieno di buona sorte e fate che le piache sieno sotigli e picciole e che le chasse sieno si picciole che ne vada .III. per migliaro".

<sup>3</sup> Bassano, p.22.

<sup>4</sup> Soap was one of the items traded by the Venetian merchant Pignol Zucchello, 1345.v.15 = Zucchello, no.14, p.34; 1344.iii.19 = *ibid*, no.8, p.22; 1345.v.26 = *ibid*, no.15, p.37, p.38; 1345.x.4 = *ibid*, no.16, p.41 and 1345.x.5 = *ibid*, no.17, p.42 (same soap); 1345.x.5 = *ibid*, no.18, p.43; 1345.x.27 = *ibid*, no.19, p.45.

and Pera<sup>1</sup>, of Chios<sup>2</sup>, Mytilene<sup>3</sup> and Lesser Armenia<sup>4</sup>. The Mamluks sought after it and it was sold in the markets of Alexandria<sup>5</sup>. In Anatolia, the Genoese were active in importing soap into Theologos<sup>6</sup>, from Naples<sup>7</sup>, Gaeta<sup>8</sup> and Chios<sup>9</sup>, and into Balat (Palatia)<sup>10</sup>. The Venetians too traded soap into Aydın<sup>11</sup> and it was sold in Antalya<sup>12</sup> and in Samsun (Simiso) where, in 1437, it fetched 205 aspers per

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.33; 1437.viii.23 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.97, p.196, c.100, p.203 (from Messina); 1437.viii.22 = *ibid*, c.96, p.194, c.97. p.197 (also from Messina as the entry involves the same people as in the immediately preceding reference); 1437.ix.2 = *ibid*, c.119, p.240, c.97, p.197 (from Gaeta); 1436.i.22 = *ibid*, c.43, p.86, c.16, p.33, c.17, p.35 (from Ancona).

<sup>2</sup> 1349 (?) = Zucchello, no.67, p.125 (Venetian soap).

<sup>3</sup> 1437 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.96, p.194, c.97, p.197, refers to a payment for soap, removed from a sack on a ship in Mytilene: "a di dito per saoni de raxon de ser Piero Michiel e Marin Barbo per l'amontar de peze 8 de saon ch'el me dise aver tolte de un sacho per far un prexente a Metelin, meto fose r 10, cusi d'avixo".

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.59.

<sup>5</sup> Piloti, p.20.

<sup>6</sup> 1377 = Musso, *Navigazione*, pp.169-170 (100 kantars of soap to Theologos).

<sup>7</sup> 1376.vi.22 = Day, *Douanes*, I, p.271.

<sup>8</sup> 1377.iii.13 = ASG, *Notai Ignoti A.7.1.*, doc.99, published in Musso, *Navigazione*, pp.232-233.

<sup>9</sup> 1394.ix.24 = ASG, *Notaio Donato de Clavaro*, Sc.39, filze 1, doc.182; 1408.ii = Argenti, *Chios*, I, p.422.

<sup>10</sup> Piloti, p.72.

<sup>11</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 7, p.191; 1353.iv.7 = *ibid*, doc.1353A, clause 20, p.214.

<sup>12</sup> Pegolotti, pp.57-58.

*kantar*<sup>1</sup>. Calculating on an exchange rate of 19 *aspers* of Samsun per *hyperpyron*<sup>2</sup>, the soap sold in Samsun for 10.79 *hyperpyra* per *kantar*, comperable with what it would have fetched in Constantinople where in the same period soap from Ancona sold for ten *hyperpyra* six *karati*<sup>3</sup>, that from Me<sup>s</sup>ina for nine and a half *hyperpyra* per *kantar*<sup>4</sup> and soap of unspecified origin at ten and a half *hyperpyra* per *kantar*<sup>5</sup>. Soap continued to be imported into the Ottoman empire into the sixteenth century<sup>6</sup>.

Soap was clealy a profitable item of trade for in 1344 the merchant Francesco Bartolomei wrote from Chios to Pignol Zucchello in Venice to send him soap as he considered this commodity a good investment and one which, provided it was of good quality, he could do better with than any other<sup>7</sup>.

Being profitable, soap was, like any commodity, subject to plunder. In 1413 a settlement was organised between Vicencio Rubeo and Masimo Formica, arbitrators for Nani (?) de Paci, and Petro de Alticio, procurator for Lillio de Blaxio, part of which concerned 45 cases of soap plundered by Petro de Laranda when on the ship of Johannes Alfirius (?) de

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.44, p.89.

<sup>2</sup> This rate is given by Badoer, 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.44, p.89. See also chart of exchange ratios for Samsun *aspers* to *hyperpyron*.

<sup>3</sup> 1436.1.22 = *ibid*, c.43, p.86.

<sup>4</sup> 1437.viii.23 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.97, p.196.

<sup>5</sup> 1437.viii.22 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.96, p.194.

<sup>6</sup> Bassano, p.22.

<sup>7</sup> 1344.iii.19 = Zucchello, no.8, p.22.

Ancona and 40 boxes, also plundered by Petro, this time from Lillio's warehouse in Gelibolu (Gallipoli)<sup>1</sup>.

Soap was taxed on entry into the beylik of Aydın where, during the first part of the fourteenth century, the tax levied was either two gold *florins* per 23.5 *batman* or per Cypriot *kantar* or if the soap was in a sack, or at the rate of one gold *florin* per *cassa*<sup>2</sup>. Aydın imposed a rate of two pieces of soap per *cassia* or two *stavrate* in 1337<sup>3</sup> and 5 *çiliatos* per *capsa* in 1353<sup>4</sup>. Interestingly soap only appears as attracting a special customs rate in Aydın, no special rate being applied to it in the treaties between Venice and Menteşe or in extant documents from the reign of Mehmed II.

Collection of the tax on soap was handled by tax farmers in the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın. In the treaty of March 1337 between Menteşe and Crete a clause specified that if the emir of Aydın made peace with Venice but kept wine, alum and soap subject to *appalto*, then the emir of Menteşe, İbrahim, would make alum subject to *appalto* in Balat (Palatia) only<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> (?) 1413.vi. = ASG, Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1, doc.69.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.56.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 7, p.191.

<sup>4</sup> 1353.iv.7 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1353A, clause 20, p.214.

<sup>5</sup> 1337.pre iv. = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337M, clause 28, pp.199-200. This clause is repeated in the treaty of 1375 between Crete and Menteşe: 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 28, p.223. As it is a straight copy of the clause of the 1337 treaty, as are other clauses which are clearly no longer relevant, it seems probable that it is anachronistic and does not in fact reflect the situation in 1375.

The imposition of *appalto* on soap was however soon lifted for the Venetians<sup>1</sup>. It is presumably significant of the importance of soap as an import that it was specifically mentioned in the treaties between Menteşe, Aydın and Crete, when it is usually mentioned in conjunction with alum and wine.

Other luxury items were imported from the west into Turchia, including the aromatic gum, mastic, used for chewing and as a base for perfume<sup>2</sup>, which was produced only in Chios<sup>3</sup>. From there it was exported both to the west, being sold in Pisa in the early fourteenth century<sup>4</sup>, and to other parts of the eastern Mediterranean including Damascus and Alexandria<sup>5</sup>. Mastic sales in Turchia at the end of the fourteenth century were controlled by *appaltatores*, a group of whom in 1394 bought for eight years control of the sales of 200 *kantars* annually in Turchia and Romania, for which they paid 25 gold *ducats* per *kantar*. They similarly controlled mastic sales in Egypt and Syria for ten years from

---

<sup>1</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192 ; 1337.pre iv. = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 22, p.222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231 (doc.1403M DVL, clause 22, p.231, uses the word *dacium* in place of *gabella*). 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 22, p.236, refers to no *amaliu* on soap.

<sup>2</sup> Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, p.149.

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, pp.71-72.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, p.207. It sold there in the early part of the fourteenth century for four *soldi* per *centinaio*.

<sup>5</sup> Piloti, p.72. It sold there at the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries for 100 *ducats* per *cassa*.

January 1396, for an annual sale of 114 *kantars*, for the price of 190 gold *florins* per *kantar*. This indicates that Turchia and Romania were importing considerably more mastic than Egypt and Syria, and gives an idea of the price of mastic in Turkish markets in this period, for the mastic cannot have sold, at least under normal circumstances, for less than 25 *ducats* per *kantar*, and indeed should have sold for a prices significantly more than this in order to make the deal attractive to the *appaltatores*<sup>1</sup>. Mastic was also imported by the Turks. In 1404 Cagi Mostaffa (Hacı/kadı Mustafa) bought 13 boxes of mastic from Elias Sacerdotus to be handed over in Bergamo or Jasmati (??Çeşme)<sup>2</sup>.

Other luxury items, such as jewels, were traded round the eastern Mediterranean and brought into Turchia by western merchants. Some of this trade went through Chios and jewels leaving the island were placed under *gabella*<sup>3</sup>. In 1381 there was a dispute involving pearls between merchants in Chios<sup>4</sup>. Some jewels were traded into Anatolia. In 1439 a ruby weighing around 15 *karati* and valued at 100 *hyperpyra*, was sent to Edirne<sup>5</sup>. Glass too was imported<sup>6</sup>.

Turchia was not just a market for imported luxuries. It

---

<sup>1</sup> 1394.vi.17 = ASG, Notaio Donato de Clavaro, sc.39, filze 1, doc.224/299.

<sup>2</sup> 1404.xii.31 = ASG, Gregorio Panissario, sc.37, filze 1, doc.49.

<sup>3</sup> 1408.ii : Argenti, Chios, I, p.422.

<sup>4</sup> 1381.ii.15 = ASG, cartulare 175, ff.110v-111r.

<sup>5</sup> 1439.ii.3 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.199, p.401, c.386, p.774

<sup>6</sup> Ashtor, *Social and Economic History*, p.262.

too exported items such as spices. Antalya was a market for indigo, sold there by the *peso sotile*, henna, sold by the *calbano* (steelyard balance)<sup>1</sup>, safron and sesame<sup>2</sup>. The last two spices were exported from other parts of Turchia, including Alanya, Balat, where the Genoese were active in exporting these commodities, and Gelibolu<sup>3</sup>. Tragacanth too was exported from Antalya and "draganti di Turchia" is listed by Pegolotti<sup>4</sup>. Tragacanth sold in Alexandria, Maiorca, and Venice<sup>5</sup>.

Antalya was also a market for pepper<sup>6</sup>, a commodity bought by the Genoese and other western merchants in various parts of Turchia and exported to cities in western Europe. Pepper from Theologos was imported into Genoa, where it was taxed on entry in 1377<sup>7</sup>. Pepper was also traded in Bursa<sup>8</sup> where it was sometimes bought by bartering. In 1439 Damian Spinola bought pepper there for Gaicomo Badoer bartering 24 sacks of "canevaza" and five sacks of wool which had been

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, pp.57=58.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.60.

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, pp.60, 61, 62, 63, 73.

<sup>4</sup> Pegolotti, pp.294, 376.

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, pp.70, 123, 138.

<sup>6</sup> Pegolotti, pp.57-58. It was sold there by the *peso sotile*.

<sup>7</sup> 1377.viii.19 = Day, *Douanes*, II, p.928.

<sup>8</sup> 1436.xi.8 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.33, p.66, c.33, p.67; 1437.xii.28 = *ibid*, c.134, p.270, c.227, p.457. There is a further entry connected with expense on the pepper, c.134, p.270, c.290, p.583.

sent to him for that purpose<sup>1</sup>. In 1437 Azi Baba, described variously as a Saracen ("sarain")<sup>2</sup> and as a Moor ("more")<sup>3</sup>, bartered five *kantars* of pepper and "de musico" for "pani in bruodo de grana", which came to three *pani* 155 *pichi* at 250 *hyperpyra* per *peza*, a total 717 *hyperpyra* 14 *karati*<sup>4</sup>. At other times pepper was bought with cash. In 1437 Elia Dedimari, a Jew, sold 20 - 25 *kantars* of pepper to Antonio Chontarini at 60 *hyperpyra* per *kantar* (5.45 *aspers*), for part of which sale he was to be paid 5,100 *aspers* (463 *hyperpyra* 15 *karati*)<sup>5</sup>. These *aspers* were sent by Giacomo Badoer in Constantinople to Antonio Chontarini in Bursa with orders that he should buy pepper<sup>6</sup>. There was a 1% charge for the purchase of these *aspers* in Constantinople<sup>7</sup>.

There is some extant information for prices of pepper in Bursa in the late 1430s and on the expenses involved in purchase. Three prices are given by Badoer for 1436 and 1437 of 60, 63.3 and 69.5 *hyperpyra* per *kantar*, giving an average of 64.3 *hyperpyra*, which can presumably be used as a rough guide to pepper prices in this period. The expenses given

---

<sup>1</sup> 1439.ii.26 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.388, p.778, c.385, p.773, c.372, p.747.

<sup>2</sup> 1437.xii.4 = *ibid*, c.148, p.298.

<sup>3</sup> 1437.ix.17 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.148, p.299.

<sup>4</sup> 1437.xi.18 = *ibid*, c.148, p.298, c.111, p.225.

<sup>5</sup> 1437.viii.21 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.93, p.188, c.92, p.187. There is another entry for 19 *kantars* 31 *rotoli* bought from Elia Dedimari by Giacomo Badoer, 1436.xi.15 = *ibid*, c.47, p.94, c.126, p.255.

<sup>6</sup> 1437.vii.24 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.47, p.94, c.92, p.187.

<sup>7</sup> 1437.vii.24 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.92, p.186, c.77, p.157.



for the same period were 4.5% and 5% of the purchase price, again a rough guide to what western merchants were likely to incur on pepper bought in Turchia. In 1436 Christofal Bonifazio sent to Constantinople from Bursa 10 pounds (*pondi*) of pepper which he bought for 785 *aspers* (69.5 *hyperpyra*) per *kantar*. The gross weight of these sacks was 25 *kantars* 79 *rotoli*, the tare for the sacks was 82 *rotoli* and for dust at 1% was 26, making a net weight of 24 *kantars* 71 *rotoli*. The expenses involved in the purchase were 16 *aspers* for cartage to his house, ten *aspers* for "quel dal chavarserà", 100 *aspers* for ten sacks, 30 *aspers* for 15 ropes, 20 *aspers* for binding, 20 *aspers* for "siagardana", 40 *aspers* for weighing ("pexador"), eight *aspers* for "el fante", and 75 *aspers* for cartage to the sea, 150 *aspers* for customs, 50 *aspers* for storage and provisions at 2%, making 388 *aspers*. Thus the total expenses on pepper bought for 19,397 *aspers* were 907 *aspers*, or around 4.5%<sup>1</sup>. The following year Christofal

---

<sup>1</sup> 1436.xi.8 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.33, p.66, c.33, p.67. The *asper/hyperpyron* exchange rate is given as 11 *aspers* four *tornexi* to one *hyperpyron*. There are several other entries under the same date for pepper from Bursa but it seems that they are dealing with the same pepper. One is for five pounds (*pondi*) of pepper, gross weight 13 *kantars* 90 *rotoli*, tare for sack and rope 30 *rotoli*, at six *rotoli* per sack, tare for dust 14 *rotoli* at 1%, net weight 13 *kantars* 46 *rotoli*, bought in Bursa by Christofal Bonifazio at the same rate of 785 *aspers* per *kantar* (68 *hyperpyra* 22.5 *karati*) *kantar* (1436.xi.8 = *ibid*, c.33, p.66, c.33, p.67). A second entry is again for five pounds of pepper, this time specified as being from the ten pounds sent from Bursa by Christofal Bonifazio, gross weight of 13 *kantars* 18 *rotoli*, tare of 30 *rotoli* for the sacks and cords at six *rotoli* per sack, and 13 *rotoli* for dust, making a net weight of 12 *kantars* 75 *rotoli*, selling at 785 *aspers* per *kantar* (68 *hyperpyra* 22.5 *karati*) *kantar* (1436.xi.8 = *ibid*, c.18, p.36, c.33, p.67.) The figures in the two separate entries for five sacks each of pepper add up to the combined figure for the ten sacks.

Bonifazio sent one pound (*pondo*) from Bursa, weighing two *kantars* 86 *rotoli* of Constantinople, 259 *rotoli* net weight of Bursa, costing 665 *aspers* per *kantar* (total of 1,722 *aspers*) to Constantinople. The expenses were two *karati* for sending the pepper from Bonifazio's house for weighing and back, 64 *aspers* (six *hyperpyra*) for sending it to Constantinople, and 34 *aspers* (3.2 *hyperpyra*) for provisions. The total expenditure on the pepper purchased for 1,722 *aspers* (164 *hyperpyra*) was 98 *aspers* (173 *hyperpyra* seven *karati*), or around 5%<sup>1</sup>.

Turchia was an area of horse-breeding and among the commodities it exported was livestock. Marco Polo commented on the outstanding breed of horses called Turki and excellent mules found in Turkomania (Anatolia) which sold for high prices<sup>2</sup>. Horses were much prized in Turchia and given as gifts. Mehmed Aydınoğlu sent an excellent horse to ibn Battuta as a present and Umur Aydınoğlu presented Şeyh İzz al-Din with three horses, all harnessed<sup>3</sup>. The Germiyan ambassador to Murad I gave good horses as *peşkeş*, and horses, together with mules and camels, were sent to him from the Sancak beys<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.xii.28 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.134, p.270, c.227, p.457. There is a further entry connected with expense on the pepper, c.134, p.270, c.290, p.583.

<sup>2</sup> Polo, (Rugoff), p.50. While admiring the horses, Marco Polo was not so impressed with the people. They were, he said, "a primitive people and dull of intellect".

<sup>3</sup> ibn Battuta, pp.302,307,311.

<sup>4</sup> Neşri, (Menzil Codex), pp.55, 56; (1949), pp.204, 206; Aşıkpaşazade, (Giese), p.52, 53; (Istanbul), pp.56, 57.

Both the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın exacted export taxes on livestock leaving their territories. Horses exported from Menteşe by the Venetians, and presumably by other western merchants, were charged at the rate of three aspers per animal, and pack horses, asses or mules at two aspers per beast, the same rate being levied on cattle<sup>1</sup>. In Aydın too there was an export tax imposed on livestock exported by western merchants<sup>2</sup>.

Both the Genoese on Cyprus and the Venetians on Crete looked to Turchia as a source for horses. In 1383 there was a discussion in Cyprus over whether or not to buy 200 horses from Anatolia (probably from Karaman)<sup>3</sup>. The authorities on Crete bought 500 horses there in the early 1360s<sup>4</sup>. A supply of horses was important to Crete where, in 1356, the Venetian Senate granted a total exemption from tax on all imports of horses and other beasts<sup>5</sup>. Venice assigned money to the authorities on the island for the purchase of horses. In 1333 the amount of money assigned for this was increased from 2,000 *hyperpyra* to 4,000 *hyperpyra* with instructions that the entente with the Ottoman ruler Orhan over the import into

---

<sup>1</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187; 1337.pre iv. = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 20, p.198; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 20, p.222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, doc.1403M DVL, clause 20, p.230; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 20, p.236.

<sup>2</sup> 1353.iv.7 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1353A, clause 19, p.214.

<sup>3</sup> 1383.viii.1 = ASG, *Cartulare* 381, ff.148r-151r.

<sup>4</sup> 1363-5 = Andraea Naugerii, '*Historia Veneta*', col.1049.

<sup>5</sup> 1356.vii.7 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, doc.300, pp.82-83.

Crete of horses and corn was to be handled by the Cretan authorities<sup>1</sup>. In 1363 the Cretan authorities sought to have the 500 *hyperpyra* allocated to buying horses in Turchia increased to 1,000 *hyperpyra*, as 500 *hyperpyra* was considered insufficient<sup>2</sup>.

The Turks were not always willing to export their horses. In 1365 the Hospitallers were forced, due to Turkish annoyance over the capture of Alexandria that year by King Peter of Cyprus, to buy horses in Apulia rather than Turchia<sup>3</sup>. Some years later the Venetians sent an ambassador to the emir of Theologos to try and persuade him to reconsider his restriction on the trade in these animals<sup>4</sup>.

Apart from livestock, Turchia also exported skins and hides, which, in Menteşe and Aydın, were not, for the Venetians, to be placed under *appalto*<sup>5</sup>. It seems that there was some sort of restriction in Menteşe over the sale of tanned hides (*pellamen*) and leather (*corame*) for permission was granted to Venetians trading there to buy them in the territories and markets of Menteşe, and not merely from the

---

<sup>1</sup> 1336.xi.16 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, doc.38, pp.30-31.

<sup>2</sup> 1363.vi.8 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, doc.410, pp.106-107.

<sup>3</sup> 1365.xii.4, Luttrell, 'Hospitallers', p.113, note 55, citing the archives in Malta.

<sup>4</sup> 1400.viii.19 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, doc.988, pp.12-13.

<sup>5</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192; 1337.pre iv. = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 22, p.222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 22, p.236.

butchers<sup>1</sup>. The Genoese too traded in hides, exporting tanned leather from Balat<sup>2</sup>. Tanned leather and sheepskin (*Pele de chastron*) were exported from Gelibolu<sup>3</sup>, and sheepskin (*montonine*) and leather (*chordoani*) from Bursa and Edirne<sup>4</sup>. Goatshide was produced in Anatolia and goats' hair, which sold well in Turchia, was used by the Turks to make cloths and ropes for their Arab horses<sup>5</sup>.

Turkish merchants traded hides with western merchants including the Venetians. In 1438 Azi (Aziz?), a Turk, sold to Jeronimo Badoer 800 "pele de chastron de Mar Mazor crude" for 16 *hyperpyra* per *kantar*<sup>6</sup>. Turks were also involved in other capacities in the trade in hides, acting for example as carriers. In 1437 a Turk called Jascia (Yahya?), a carrier, was involved with Sulia dal Mistrini, also described as a carrier, in the sale to an agent of Badoer of 20 bales of

---

<sup>1</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 14, p.189;

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.73.

<sup>3</sup> Piloti, pp.62,63. 1438.xi.26 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.277, p.556, c.197, p.397. In 1438, 70 "pele bianche" from Gelibolu were sent exported from Constantinople.

<sup>4</sup> 1438.xi.4 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.277, p.556, c.266, p.535, (one bale of "montonine bianche" was sold in Bursa and six bales in Edirne); 1438.x.14 = *ibid*, c.154, p.310, c.266, p.535, (14 bales of "montonine bianche" were sent to Constantinople from Bursa; 1438.xii.22 = *ibid*, c.306, p.615, ("montonine e chordani vermei abude de Adrenopoli"); 1439.ii.26 = *ibid*, c.414, p.830, c.367, p.737, ("montonine bianche" sold in Edirne); 1439.ix.20 = *ibid*, c.358, p.718, c.234, p.471, (1,000 "montonine" sold in Edirne, cost, including expenses, 3,176.5 *aspers* (310 *hyperpyra*).

<sup>5</sup> Pegolotti, p.379.

<sup>6</sup> 1438.iii.7 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.196, p.394, c.186, p.375.

"pelle de chastron", containing 1,000 hides, for which Sulia received, for carterage of 700 hides, weighing 33 *kantars*, at five *aspers* per *kantar*, 14 *hyperpyra* 21 *kantars*<sup>1</sup>, and Jascia, for carterage of 300 hides, weighing 14 *kantars*, at five *aspers* per *kantar*, six *hyperpyra* seven *karati*<sup>2</sup>.

From Badoer's accounts it is possible to build up some guide to prices of hides sold in Turchia in the late 1430s. These were on average around 3.5 *aspers* per piece for sheepskin (*montonine*) and around ten *aspers* for leather (*chordoani*). Shee<sup>e</sup>skins sold in 1437 for four *aspers* each, the price including unspecified expenses to bring them to Constantinople<sup>3</sup>, four *aspers* each<sup>4</sup>, the same rate in Bursa<sup>5</sup> and three *aspers* each<sup>6</sup>. The following year sheepskins were sold in Bursa for 3.5, 3.25, and 3 *aspers* each<sup>7</sup>. In 1438,

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.iv.30 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.56, p.112, c.3, p.7. The *asper/hyperpyron* exchange was 11 *aspers* two *tornexi* to one *hyperpyron*.

<sup>2</sup> 1438.iv.30 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.56, p.112, c.36, p.73. The *aspers/hyperpyron* exchange was 11 *aspers* 1.5 *tornexi*.

<sup>3</sup> 1437.iii.16 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.61, p.122, c.57, p.115. The *asper/hyperpyron* exchange rate was 9:100.

<sup>4</sup> 1437.iii.16 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.61, p.122, ("montonine vermeie"). The *asper/hyperpyron* exchange rate was 9:100.

<sup>5</sup> 1437.vii.23 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.61, p.122, c.33, p.67, ("montonine vermeie" ). The exchange rate was 11 *aspers* to one *hyperpyron*.

<sup>6</sup> 1437.iii.16 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.61, p.122, c.57, p.115, ("montonine bianche chonza de foia solamente"). The *asper/hyperpyron* exchange rate, although not given here, was 9:100 for the total of 30 *aspers* is given as the equivalent of two *hyperpyra* 17 *karati*.

<sup>7</sup> 1438.ix.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.266, p.534, c.225, p.453.

584 "montonine bianche" were sold in Edirne for three *aspers* (2.85 *hyperpyra*) each<sup>1</sup>. In the same year Pipo de Jachomo bought various amounts of "montonine" in Turchia, possibly in Edirne<sup>2</sup>, paying 3.75 *aspers* (0.28 of a *hyperpyron*) each for "montine rose"<sup>3</sup>, and three *aspers* (2.85 *hyperpyra*) each in Edirne for "montonine bianche"<sup>4</sup>. Leather was more expensive. "Chordoani vermei" sold for 11.5 *aspers* each<sup>5</sup> and "chordoani" fetched nine *aspers* per *pezo* in Edirne<sup>6</sup>. Sheepskin (*pele de chastron*) was slightly cheaper than sheepskin (*montonine*), selling in 1437 for two *aspers* each<sup>7</sup>.

Badoer's accounts also give an idea of the expenses incurred by western merchants buying and exporting hide from Ottoman territories. These were, on average, in the region of 13% of the purchase price. In 1438, 2,075 sheepskins were bought in Bursa by Christofal Bonifazio for 6,571 *aspers*,

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.x.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.266, p.534, c.232, p.467.

<sup>2</sup> That his purchases were made in Turchia is clear from the exchange rate given for *aspers* (10.5:1), the rate of exchange for Turkish *aspers*. Other entries for goods sent by Pipo Jachomo at the same date place him in Edirne. He may therefore well have bought the hides and leather there, although this is not specified in the text.

<sup>3</sup> 1438.viii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.197, p.396, c.230, p.462. The *asper/hyperpyron* exchange rate was 10.5:1.

<sup>4</sup> 1438.x.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.266, p.534, c.230, p.463. The *asper/hyperpyron* exchange rate was 10.5:1.

<sup>5</sup> 1437.iii.16 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.61, p.122, c.57, p.115. The *asper/hyperpyron* exchange rate was 9:100. The entry of c.57, p.115 gives an incorrect total.

<sup>6</sup> 1438.viii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.197, p.396, c.230, p.462.

<sup>7</sup> 1438.iv.30 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.56, p.112, c.17, p.35. The sale consisted of 20 bales of "pelle de chastron", containing 1,000 hides.

being sold at 3.5, 3.25, and 3 *aspers* each, and sent from there to Constantinople<sup>1</sup>. The expenses incurred by Bonifazio in Bursa were for 103 *aspers* transporting them to his house, for tying them and for rope, 75 *aspers* for carterage at the rate of ten *aspers* per *soma*, 248 *aspers* for weighing ("peazo") and customs at 35 *aspers* per *soma*, 60 *aspers* for storage at four *aspers* per *tango*, and 131 *aspers* and for provisions at 2%. Thus the total expenses were 617 *aspers* on a purchase price of 6,571 *aspers*, (652.8 *hyperpyra*) or 9.4%.

On top of this figure should be added other expenses involved in transporting the hides to Constantinople. The freightage charged for three *tangi* of sheepskins, made up of 450 skins, and transported by Statopira, a boatman ("barcharuol"), was one *hyperpyra* 18 *karati*<sup>2</sup>. The freightage charge for a further five *tangi*, consisting of 639 sheepskins, paid to Vasilicho, a boatman ("barcharuol"), was two *hyperpyra* 12 *karati*, and the cost of portorage ("chamali") was eight *karati*. The cost of portorage for a further six *tangi*, sent by the boat ("barcha") of Manguzo, from Bursa, was five *karati*, while the freight charge for the remaining *tango* sent from Bursa on the boat ("gripò") of Piero "varoter", and for portorage ("chamalo") was 13 *karati*<sup>3</sup>. Thus the total freightage costs for transporting

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.ix.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.266, p.534, c.225, p.453.

<sup>2</sup> 1438.viii.7 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.225, p.452.

<sup>3</sup> 1438.ix.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.225, p.452, c.227, p.457. The exchange rate for *aspers* to *hyperpyra* was 10.5:1.



2,075 hides from Bursa to Constantinople was five *hyperpyra* eight *karati* which, if added to the 617 *aspers* (58.76 *hyperpyra*, ie. c.58 *hyperpyra* 18 *karati*) expended in Bursa makes a total expenditure of 64 *hyperpyra* which gives a total percentage expense charge of 9.8% on an initial purchase of 6,571 *aspers*, (652.8 *hyperpyra*).

The percentage figure from the same period for expenses on hide purchased in Edirne is considerably higher. In 1438 Pipo de Jachomo bought in Edirne 584 "montonine bianche" at three *aspers* each (2.85 *hyperpyra*), making a total of 1,752 *aspers* (166.86 *hyperpyra*)<sup>1</sup>. The expenses on this purchase in Edirne were four *hyperpyra* six *karati* freightage for six bales from Montanea and porterage to the house, 14 *hyperpyra* for provisions and ten *hyperpyra* for 40 *pichi* of canvas, rope and tying the bales, for carriage to the port and onto the ship, making a total of 28 *hyperpyra* six *karati*<sup>2</sup> on a purchase of 1,752 *aspers* (166.86 *hyperpyra*), or c.17%, which seems rather high.

In 1437, 20 bales of "pelle de chastron", containing 1,000 hides were sold at two *aspers* each, making a total of 2,000 *aspers*, and associated expenses were 87 *aspers* for porterage, tying and ropes, 40 *aspers* for brokerage (*sansaria*) at 1% and provisions at 1%, 24 *aspers* for weighing ("peazo de chari 3") and eight *aspers* for storage, a total for expenses of 159 *aspers* (14.3 *hyperpyra*). Other

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.x.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.266, p.534, c.230, p.463. The *asper*/ *hyperpyron* exchange rate was 10.5:1.

<sup>2</sup> 1438.x.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.266, p.534, c.232, p.467.

expenses were 19 *karati* for unloading at the warehouse and reloading on the boat ("barcha"), and six *hyperpyra* 18 *karati* for port entrance and taxes to the Greeks ("intrada a la porta a duchatei 2 e per charo e per datio a Griexi a perp.2 car.3 per charo"), making a total of seven *hyperpyra* 13 *karati*<sup>1</sup>. Total expenses were thus 21.8 *hyperpyra* on a total purchase price of 2,000 aspers (180 *hyperpyra*) or 12% in line with the percentage expenses in Bursa in the following year.

Furs too were exported from Gelibolu and into Constantinople<sup>2</sup>, from Stalimini<sup>3</sup> and from Samsun where, in 1437, 26 "martori" and "funie 4 chonzi" were bought for 445 aspers (23 *hyperpyra* ten *karati*)<sup>4</sup>. Samsun also exported hair. In 1437, 304 *dexena* of hair, at 22 aspers (1.15 *hyperpyra*) per *dexena*, were bought there by Antonio da Negroponte for a total of 680 aspers (35.78 *hyperpyra*) and then sold by him in Trabzon for 2,038 Trabzon aspers (50.95 *hyperpyra*)<sup>5</sup>, approximately 42% more than its sale price in

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.iv.30 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.56, p.112, c.17, p.35.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.62.

<sup>3</sup> 1398.i.10 = ASG, Notaio Giovanni Bardi, cartulare 382, f.45r.

<sup>4</sup> 1437.xi.28 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.102, p.206, c.152, p.307. The exchange rate given on c.102 is 17 aspers od Samsun to one *hyperpyron* so the exchange should have been for 445 aspers 26.17 *hyperpyra*. A note in the text states that the original figure was 26 *hyperpyra* four *karati* and that it was corrected to 21 *hyperpyra* ten *karati*. The usual exchange rate at this time was 19 aspers per *hyperpyron*, calculating by which 445 aspers would equal 23.42 *hyperpyra*. In fact the rate of 19:1 is given pn c.152.

<sup>5</sup> 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *ibro*, c.152, p.306, c.152, p.307. The exchange rate of Samsun aspers per *hyperpyron* was 19:1, and for Trabzon aspers per *hyperpyron*, 40:1.

Samsun. If one judges roughly from the expenses incurred on hide, the expenses may have been in the region of 13% of the purchase price, making the mark-up on the the hair fairly high, at 29% of the original purchase price. This must indicate either that it was an expensive commodity per se, which seems unlikely in a country which produced vast quantities of livestock and would thus have had large reserves of hair at its disposal, or, much more likely, that it was sought after in Trabzon, where the terrain of the small state was not so suited to livestock rearing as were the lands of Turchia. The people of Trabzon may perhaps have used the hair, as the Turks did, for making ropes and coverings for horses<sup>1</sup>.

There are also instances of the export from Turchia of horse and cattle hearts<sup>2</sup>. In 1437 one of the commodities bought by Antonio de Negroponte in Samsun was 33 *pezi* of "chuori de bo chonzi", which cost 714 *aspers* (37.57 *hyperpyra*) and which he re-sold in Trabzon at 65 and 75 *aspers* of Trabzon per piece, making a total of 1,708 *aspers* (42.7 *hyperpyra*)<sup>3</sup>. Before expenses Antonio therefore made 5.13 *hyperpyra*, approximately 13.5%. In 1438 Pipo de Jachomo sent 15 "chuori de bo" from Turchia to Constantinople at a cost, including both purchase and transport expenses of 22

---

<sup>1</sup> Pegolotti, p.379.

<sup>2</sup> Pegolotti, p.85, lists goods, including horses's hearts, from Turchia, Rhodes, Syria, Egypt and Armenia paying the *missa* tax in Cyprus.

<sup>3</sup> 1437.xii.18 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.152, p.306, c.152, p.307.

*hyperpyra* 12 *karati*. If one calculates at approximately 13% for expenses, the hearts must have cost in the region of 19.6 *hyperpyra* or 1.3 *hyperpyra* per heart. In Constantinople they were valued at 1.5 *hyperpyra* each<sup>1</sup>. Other "chuori de bo chonzo" in Constantinople sold in the same period for one *hyperpyra* 18 *karati* (1.75 *hyperpyra*)<sup>2</sup>.

Another agricultural export from Anatolia was foodstuffs such as pulses which were sold in Antalya<sup>3</sup> and, together with grain, were charged an export tax for Venetians in Aydın of 4%<sup>4</sup>. In Menteşe, Venetians paid on exported pulses at the rate of one *asper* per *modium* throughout the fourteenth and into the fifteenth centuries<sup>5</sup>. The Hospitallers too bought victuals in Anatolia<sup>6</sup>.

One commodity which was exported from Turchia but was on occasion banned was timber. There was a ship-building industry in Antalya and timber from there was exported to

---

<sup>1</sup> 1438.x.20 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.215, p.432, c.230, p.463.

<sup>2</sup> 1438.vii.1 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.215, p.432.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, pp.57-58. They were sold there by the *moggio* and the *ghilla*.

<sup>4</sup> 1353.iv.7 = Zahcariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1353A, clause 19, p.214: "frumentum vel alia victualia vel legumina".

<sup>5</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1331M, clause 3, p.187; 1337.pre iv. = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 20, p.198; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 20, p.222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, clause 22, p.230; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 22, p.236.

<sup>6</sup> Luttrell, 'Hospitallers', pp.35, 113 and note 55, citing the archivals in Malta. That the Hospitallers exported foodstuffs from Turchia is shown by their difficulties in 1365 when, due to Turkish anger over the fall of Alexandria, they were forced to bring victuals from Apulia instead.

Cairo<sup>1</sup>, as was pitch ("pece")<sup>2</sup>, which sold in Antalya by the steelyard balance<sup>3</sup>. On occasion Turkish rulers banned the export of timber from their territories to the west for the emir of Theologos, despite granting freedom of trade to the Venetians in 1400, refused to extend this to timber<sup>4</sup>. In 1379 the Pope granted the Hospitallers permission to import corn and other foodstuffs from Anatolia, provided that there was no timber traded in return<sup>5</sup>. This would seem to indicate that timber was sometimes imported into Turchia. However, this seems unlikely as the Hospitallers would hardly have been trading timber with their enemies, even in return for foodstuffs, and, in any case, Turchia was an exporter of timber and so less likely to be in need of supplies from outside. The explanation may be that this phrase is merely a formula included in such types of Papal permissions, but without meaning.

Wax was exported from Anatolia, from Theologos, where it was taxed on exit at 2%<sup>6</sup>, and from Antalya where it was sold by the *peso sotile*<sup>7</sup>. At the end of the fourteenth century

---

<sup>1</sup> Piloti, p.61. See also p.73 where he talks of Rhodians going to Turchia to get timber which they took to Egypt. But this trade was now not going on.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.61.

<sup>3</sup> Pegolotti, p.34.

<sup>4</sup> 1400.viii.19 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, doc.988, p.12

<sup>5</sup> 1379.viii.6, Luttrell, 'Intrigue', p.35.

<sup>6</sup> Pegolotti, p.56.

<sup>7</sup> Pegolotti, pp.57-58.

and beginning of the fifteenth century it was exported from Anatolia, from Antalya, Alanya, Balat, and from the western parts of the empire, from Gelibolu and from Albania and Greece and Thessalonika<sup>1</sup>. The Genoese were active in trading it from Balat<sup>2</sup> as were the Venetians, for whom wax was not placed in *appalto* in the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın<sup>3</sup>. Some of the wax from Ottoman lands was shipped to Venice<sup>4</sup>. In 1381 a Genoese ship sailing from Theologos, and Alexandria and Beirut, carried wax as part of its cargo<sup>5</sup>. In 1402 wax was bought for Conradus de Pestino for Lodisius<sup>6</sup>. In 1437 Ramadan of Samsun sold ten *kantars* 57 *rotoli* gross of wax, tare for the sacks and ropes of 34 *rotoli*, "tara de fondi" at 4.5 *rotoli* per *kantar*, total of 45 *rotoli*, leaving a net weight of 19 *kantars* 78 *rotoli* at 22.5 *hyperpyra* per *kantar*<sup>7</sup>. Wax was still being traded by western merchants after the fall of Constantinople for Florentines were buying it in Bursa in the 1470's<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Piloti, pp.60, 61, 62, 63, 69.

<sup>2</sup> Piloti, p.72.

<sup>3</sup> 1337.iii.9 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc.1337A, clause 11, p.192; 1337.pre iv. = *ibid*, doc.1337M, clause 22, p.198; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid*, doc.1375M, clause 22, p.222; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid*, doc.1403M, clause 22, p.231; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid*, doc.1407M, clause 22, p.236.

<sup>4</sup> 1438.iii.15 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.195, p.392, c.191, p.385.

<sup>5</sup> 1381.ii.15 = ASG, cartulare 175, ff.110v-111r.

<sup>6</sup> 1402.v.30 = ASG, San Giorgio, n.590/1306, f.72v.

<sup>7</sup> 1437.vi.6 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.71, p.144, c. 48, p.97.

<sup>8</sup> Dei, p.141.

As in the case of hides and pepper, the accounts of Badoer for the late 1430s enable one to give a rough idea of expenses involved in the wax trade in Ottoman territories. In 1438 Agustin di Franchi bought three sacks of wax in Gelibolu for 1,369 *aspers* (124.45 *hyperpyra*). The expenses consisted of six *aspers* (0.5 of a *hyperpyron*) for cartage and weighing ("chamali e pexador"), five *aspers* (0.46 of a *hyperpyron*) for brokerage ("sansaria"), 23 *aspers* (two *hyperpyra*) for sacks, ropes and bagging, five *aspers* (0.46 of a *hyperpyron*) for bribing the weighing official ("magnaria al pexador"), 26 *aspers* (2.36 *hyperpyra*) for the 2% customs tax, nine *aspers* (0.8 of a *hyperpyron*) for storage and 27 *aspers* ( 2.45 *hyperpyra*) for provisions at 2%. The total expenses were thus 101 *aspers* (9.18 *hyperpyra*) on a purchase price of 1,369 *aspers* (124.45 *hyperpyra*), or 7.4%, less than the apparent average for hide and slightly more than that for pepper in this period<sup>1</sup>.

While the accounts of Badoer give specific information for the late 1430s, similar information is apparently lacking for the earlier period. However Badoer shows that items which do not appear in large numbers in other sources were being traded and were presumably bought and sold in similar quantities in the prece\_ding century.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1437.viii.5 = Badoer, *Libro*, c.191, p.384, c.175, p.353.

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSION

This thesis is an attempt to examine Turkish - Genoese relations between the rise of the beyliks and the fall of Constantinople in 1453 using predominantly western sources, in particular material from the state archives of Genoa. The investigation of Turkish-Genoese trade relations has led to two conclusions, firstly that there was without doubt a commerce whose volume and importance was considerable, and secondly that the Genoese formed an integral part of the early economic structure of the Ottoman empire.

From a combination of Genoese and other sources, a picture emerges of a flourishing trade flowing backwards and forwards across the Mediterranean, of a commerce in which volumes of commodities changed hands, and of a vast Mediterranean economic network spreading out across the Mediterranean basin and linking Turchia firmly to the Mediterranean world. Genoese merchants sailed constantly to and from the mother city, settled in Genoese trading bases in particular Pera and on the island of Chios, and established themselves also in the big commercial centres of Turchia, among them Bursa, Edirne and Samsun. Relations between the Turks and the Genoese spread out from trading into related areas. They disputed with each other in court, they made agreements, largely prompted by the desire for trade. Genoese merchants bribed Turkish officials, hired Turkish porters and guides, and leased Turkish warehouse space. A further point of contact arose over ransoming, a lucrative



way of generating income from captives and those who sold on the seething slave markets of the eastern Mediterranean. Genoese merchants were able to contact the relatives and agree a price for the return of relations, while the Turks too were able to do the same with captured Christians. Turkish likes and dislikes appear, their desire for brightly coloured cloths of turquoise, emerald and scarlet and their preferences for how the cloth was cut.

The sources, while revealing the existence of a lucrative and highly active trade between the Turks and the Genoese, also showed the Genoese merchant as an integral part of the embryonic Ottoman economy, not merely as an outside factor coming, taking and leaving, but as one of the functionaries of the state, collecting customs revenues and thus contributing to the early development of the empire, bringing into the Ottoman treasury valuable liquid assets. To this early economic structure the Genoese brought their wealth and their know-how.

The importance of this Genoese contribution to the early economic development of the Ottoman state needs further investigation to ascertain to what extent, coupled with Ottoman military might, it was a factor, used by the Ottomans, in the successful establishment of an Ottoman empire, as opposed to, for example, an empire of Menteşe or of Aydın. While any answers to such questions remain, due to the nature of the sources, largely speculative at this stage of research, the Ottomans do appear to have had a more dynamic economic policy than other Turkish rulers in the

area. In contrast to Menteşe and Aydın, who appear to have been fairly <sup>6</sup>acquiescent in their relations with western merchants, prepared to accept, for example, the situation which Venice wanted, the Ottomans seem by and large to have been more prepared to dictate terms. They were apparently more aware of their economic strength and of the importance of the Turkish market to western trading nations, and did seek to use their economic assets to strengthen their political position. Bayezid, for example, banned the export of grain and seems to have imposed <sup>5</sup>re<sup>5</sup>trictions over port access.

At the same time the Ottomans made use of the western merchants who came to their territories to trade and employed western know-how and money in the collection of taxes. This guaranteed an income to the state without much exertion on the part of the Turks, while at the same time ensuring an incentive to further commerce, for it would have been very much in the interests of those merchants collecting taxes to increase the volume of traffic that went through their hands.

While it is obviously true that without military success there could not have been an empire, it is also true that military strength alone cannot be the sole explanation for the continuing Ottoman success. Another factor in the successful creation of a lasting state may well have been Ottoman ability to absorb from those they conquered systems which were in place and which worked and to use the capital and know-how of foreign merchants.

In a more general sense, this thesis has been an attempt

to look at Ottoman history, not as something distinctly eastern as opposed to western, or to see it in the light of a western Christendom - Turkish conflict, but to see the Ottoman realm as an integral part of the Mediterranean economy. While it is undoubtedly true that the Turk was, for much of western Christendom, an infidel enemy, he was also the ruler of a huge trading bloc, and one to which merchants such as the Genoese flocked. Money largely formed the basis of the relationship between the Genoese and the Turks and this, rather than any religious scruple, dictated relations.

This thesis has thus considered the trade between the Turks and the Genoese, and in so doing has raised the question of the importance of foreign merchant capital and know-how in the early economic development and continuing success of the Ottoman state. Clearly much further research is needed, for there is a mass of data to be worked through in the state archives of Genoa alone. One possible line of investigation would be to select a short chronological period and compare the position then with that in the later fifteenth century for which Turkish sources are available. An ideal period would be the late 1430s, for the account book of Giacomo Badoer refers quite frequently to Ottoman territory giving names of merchants, dates and ships. If these names and dates were tracked through the accounts, one would be able to find other occasions on which commodities were traded into, or out of, the empire but where their destination or place of origin is not mentioned. If the data thus obtained were combined with material from the archives

of Genoa and Venice, in particular, it would be possible to build up a detailed picture of trade between western city states and Turchia in this period, giving a substantial block of data which could be used for a comparative study of the position towards the end of the century.

## **APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX ONE: DOCUMENTS

1. 1364.x.18 = ASG Notai Ignoti XVIII.14, 1st. doc.

### Summary

The appointment by Giovanni Giustiniani and Francesco Giustiniani of two agents, Bartolomeo Longo and Raffaele Sasiano, with power to make treaties in accordance with the stipulations set down in the treaty made by Giovanni Giustiniani and Francesco Giustiniani with Sarchano (ie Saruhan) Turchus and Calozeto (ie Kalothetos), Lord of Old Phokaea.

### Text

In nomine domini amen. Discreti et sapientes viri domini Johannes Justinianus et Franciscus Justinianus quondam Domenici gubernatores generales et participes, conductores et emptores insulle Siy et Follie Nove et aliorum loquorum dependencium ab <e>andem insullam Siy pro duodecimis partibus et eciam procuratores et procuratoris nominibus aliorum dominorum dicte Maone, participum, emptorum et condutorum dicte insulle et dependencium ab eandem qu[ili ] pro duodecim parte ut de predictis videlicet de procura dicti domini Johannis plene patet publico instrumento procuratore actorie scripto Janue manu Guidoris de Braccelis notarii







MCCCLXIII, die XVIIIII Julii et de procur<a><sup>1</sup> et de bayllia dicti domini Francisci patet acto publico instrumento scripto manu dicti Guidoris notarii hoc anno die habentis ad infra scripta et allia plenum et sufficiens mandatum vigore dictorum instrumentorum suis propriis nominibus et procuratoris ante dictis fecerunt, sustituerunt et locho sui dictis nominibus posuerunt procuratores, actores et factores et negociorum gestores dicte Maone providos viros dominos Bartholomeum Longum et Raffaelem Sasianum absentes quam presentes<sup>2</sup> videlicet ad paciscendum, componendum et conpromitendum et composiciones et pacta faciendum et pacem et compositionem faciendam<sup>3</sup> atque triquam et ligam faciendum et ipsam pacem, triquam et conposicionem iurandum et<sup>4</sup> iuramentum faciendum et iuramentum proinde et pro ut in quodam decreto seu tratatu dominis procuratoribus dato et tradito per dictos dominos Johannem et Franciscum gubernatores et procuratores ante dictos continentur con dominis Sarchano Turcho<sup>5</sup> et Calozeto, domino Follis Veteris.

Dantes et concedentes dictis eorum procuratoribus in predictis et circha predicto plenam largam liberam baylliam et

---

<sup>1</sup> End of the word obliterated by a hole in the manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> *providos viros dominos Bartholomeum Longum et Raffaelem Sasianum absentes quam presentes* inserted above line and along right-hand margin.

<sup>3</sup> *ad* and another word crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> Beginning of the second column.

<sup>5</sup> *Turcho* inserted above the line.

generalem administracionem con pleno largo libero et generali mandato.

Promitentes dicti domini Johannes et Franciscus suis propriis nominibus et nominibus ante dictis omnia et singula suprascripta mihi notario infrascripto tamquam publice persone<sup>1</sup> stipulanti et recipienti officio publico nomine et vice omnium et singulorum quorum interest, intererit vel inter esse poterit se ipsos perpetuo firmum et ratum habituros omne, id et totum quod, quid et quantum per dictos terorum procuratores actum, gestum, factum seu procuratum fuerit in predictis et quolibet predictorum factum<sup>2</sup>, gratum et firmum habere, tenere et in nullo contrafacere vel venire<sup>3</sup> <sub><sup>4</sup>potecha et obligatione <omn><sup>5</sup>ium bonorum suorum dictis nominibus et suis propriis nominibus pro partibus eisdem spectantibus et cuiuslibet eorum habitorum et habendorum vulerit quamdum et quolibet eorum. Relevantes dictos eorum procuratores et cuiuslibet eorum ab omne honore satisfaciendi promiserunt mihi iam dicto notario stipulanti et recipienti ut supra quod iudicio sisterint et iudicatum solverint dollo non comitentes nihi fuerint provocati de predictis versus me iam dicto notario stipulanti ut supra pro dictis eorum procuratoribus in [triceseru< >] et fide

---

<sup>1</sup> *off* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *contractum* inserted above the line.

<sup>3</sup> Beginning of a new column.

<sup>4</sup> Top of the manuscript damaged by water.

<sup>5</sup> Top of the manuscript damaged by water.

iuserunt suma potecha et obligatione.

Renuncians iuri de<sup>1</sup> princip<io> et omni alliis juri.

Actum in civitate insulle Syi in camera habitacionis dicti domini Johannis, anno dominice nativitatis MCCCLXIIII, indicione <sup>2</sup> secunda secundum cursum Ianue, die VIII Octubris paullo post nonam. Testes, Acelinus Sotus, Johannes de Podio filius Domenici et Anthonius de Sexania quondam Paganini.

2. 1389.x.26 = ASG Notail Cartulare 476, Donato de Clavaro, doc.10.2<sup>3</sup>

#### Summary

The Podestà of Pera, Antonio Leardo, and others of the Comune, knowing that their ambassador, Jane de Draperiis, has made a treaty with Bayezid I, which the Sultan wished to have ratified, swore in the presence of Bayezid's ambassador, Hasan Bey, to abide by the treaties made with Orhan and Murad.

#### Text

In nomine domini amen. Egregius et circumspectus vir dominus

---

<sup>1</sup> A word crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *prima* crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> A summary of this document has been published by Balard et al, *Documents*, no.66, p.33.

Antonius Leardus, podestas Peyre et Januensium in toto Imperio Romanie, circumspectus vir dominus Raffael Carpenetus, unius ex ambaxiatoribus, provissoribus et gubernatoribus pro comuni Janue in partibus orientalibus, absente domino Gentille de Grimaldis, altero ambaxitore provissore et gubernatore, et consilium octo Ancianorum dicti domini potestatis quorum nomina sunt: domini Petrus Ultramarinus, Percival de Porta, Brancaleo Grillus, Batista de Zoalio, Gandulfus de Turrilia, Thomas de Castellor, Raffael de Laurentiis, Johannes Demerode, habentes noticiam et certam scientiam de pace nuper firmata per Jane de Draperiis, burgensem Peyre, <a<sup>1</sup>>mbaxiatorem prefactorum dominorum potestatis provisoris et consilii, nomine comunis Janue et Peyre cum serenissimo principe et domino Basita bey Jhalabi, magno amirato amiratorum Turchie, et iuramento per eum facto presentato in scriptis in litera greca cum signo suo dicto domino potestati per dictum Jane, et volentem erga dictum dominum Basitam bey facere et iurare pro ut debent idcirco prefacti domini potestas, provissor et consilium constituti in presentia domini Casam<sup>2</sup> bey, ambaxiatoris prefacti domini Basite bey, destinati pro dicto iuramento videndo et recipiendo, iuraverunt ad sancta dei evangellia corporaliter tactis scripturis in manibus<sup>3</sup> fratris Petri de Taurixio<sup>4</sup> ordinis fratrum minorum in mam comunis

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter obscured by hole in manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> Hasan.

<sup>3</sup> Beginning of second column.

<sup>4</sup> Treviso.

Janue et Peyre et omnium Januensium, paces hinc retro factas cum dominis<sup>1</sup> Orcani bey et Morati bey et omnia et singulla in eis contenta actendere, complere et observare et actendi, compleri et observari facere per subdictos dicti comunis et contra ea in alliquo non facere vel venire aliqua ratione occasione vel causa contradici vel excogitari possit [?] per prefactum dominum Basitam Bey et suos subdictos in omnibus observentur dicte paces ut supra.

Actum Peyra in camera consiliorum <sup>2</sup> palacii dicti domini potestatis, anno dominice nativitatis MCC<C<sup>3</sup>>LXXXVIII, indicione XII secundum cursum Janue, die XXVI Octobris circa meridiem. Presentibus testibus, Johanne de Draperiis, burgense Peyre, Antonio de Grimaldis, filio Gentilis, et Bartholomeo Villanucio notario, vocatis et rogatis.

3. 1390.i.11 = ASG Notai C.476, Donato de Clavaro, doc.26.<sup>4</sup>

### Summary

Constantino de Groto brought a case against Dagnano Spinulla and Petro de Groto, guarentors for Raffaele Capello, with whom he had formed a partnership to buy copper from

---

<sup>1</sup> *dominis* inserted above line.

<sup>2</sup> *pla* crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> The third C obliterated by hole in manuscript.

<sup>4</sup> A summary of this document has been published by Balard et al, *Documents*, no.82, p.37.

Solimambasa (ie Süleyman Paşa, the İsfendiyyar oğulları ruler of Kastamonu). Constantino had bought 16 000 Kastamonu pounds of copper, equivalent to c. 4 000 *kantars* of Pera, for 476 000 silver Kastamonu *aspers*. Raffaele had not however paid Constantino the money as agreed.

### Text

In nomine domini amen. Constantinus de Groto, burgensis Peyre, in jure constitutus et in presentia Egregii et circumspecti viri domini Antonii Leardi honorabilis potestatis Peyre et Januensium in toto Imperio Romanium, pro tribunali sedentis ad solitum suum bancum juris, dicit, denunciatur et protestatur versus Dagnanum Spinullam et Petrum de Groto, burgenses Peyre, presentes<sup>1</sup> fideiussores et fideiussorio nomine Raffaelis Capelli, burgensis Peyre, de et super inferius denominatis et de scriptis, quod inter ipsum Constantinum ex una parte et dictum Raffaelem Capellum ex altera, fuit et extitit facta contracta celebrata et inita quedam compositio sive societas de et super libris sexdecim milibus rami, ad pondus egregii et potentis domini Solimambasa Turchi, domini Castamene, que capiunt et astendunt ad pondus Peyre sommam cantariorum quatuormillium vel circa, quod ramum extitit emptum per dictum Constantinum a dicto domino Solimambassa pro pretio et nomine pretii asperorum mille millium quadringentorum septuaginta sex millium argenti de Castamena. In qua compositione sive societate inita et contracta, dictus Raffael Capellus pacto

---

<sup>1</sup> *presentes* inserted above line.

convenit et solempni stipulacione et promissione convenit et promisit dicto Constantino, ibidem presenti et recipienti, dare, solvere, numerare et amonare dicto Constantino dictos asperos sive dictam<sup>1</sup> quantitatem asperorum mille millium quadringentorum septuaginta sex millium argenti de Castamena nomine et ex causa dicte emptionis dicti rami, dandam et solvendam per ipsum Constantinum dicto domino Castamene, ut de predictis omnibus seriorius et lacius apparet quadam apodixia sive scriptura scripta manu dicti Raffaelis MCCCLXXXVIII, die XX, mensis Januarii. Item per formam duorum publicorum instrumentorum, compositorum et scriptorum manu Bernabonis de Groto, notarii publici, MCCCLXXXVIII, die XVI Septembris, initorum et factorum inter dictum Constantinum ex una et pro una parte, et Georgium de Cornilia, notarium, civem Janue, procuratorem et procuratorio nomine dicti Raffaelis Capelli, ex altera parte cum plena, larga, ampla, libera bailia et administracione ut de ipsius constitucione et mandato patet publico instrumento scripto manu Lodisii Carpeneti, notarii publici, MCCCLXXXVIII, die VII Decembris, ad quorum instrumentorum et apodixie ratificacionem, convalidacionem, caupcionem et observacionem efficaciorefficiacius observandam et adimplendam et ut securum et cautum esset dictis partibus in observacione et satisfacione plenaria contentorum in dictis apodixia sive scriptura et instrumentis et ne dicte partes seu altera<sup>2</sup> earum et super contentis in eisdem apodxia sive scriptura et

---

<sup>1</sup> Beginning of second column.

<sup>2</sup> m crossed off at end of altera.

instrumentis valleant seu valleat et possit apromisis et concordentes a se se et vicisim resillere et in aliquo contrafacere vel venire<sup>1</sup> precibus mandato dicti Georgii dicto nomine inter cesserunt et fideiusserunt dicti Dagnanus Spinulla et Petrus de Groto et pro dicto Constantino dictus Petrus de Groto cumque dictus Raffael principalis nec non dicti Dagnanus et Petrus fideiussores ipsius Raffaelis sepe et sepius interpelati et requisiti per dictum Constantinum non solverit, numerarverit, tradiderit, preparaverit<sup>2</sup>, amaonaverit nec solverint, numeraverint, tradiderint, preparaverint<sup>3</sup> et amaonaverint dicto Constantino emptori dicte quantitatis rami ut promittitur dictam quantitatem asperorum mille millium quadringentorum septuaginta sexmillium argenti de Castameni debitam ex causa dicte empcionis dicto domino Castamene iuxta convencionem et promisionem<sup>4</sup> dicti Raffaelis nec non dicti Georgii procuratorio nomine ipsius et tenorum dicte apodisie scripture et instrumentorum et in ipsorum observacione prout tenebatur et tenetur dictus Raffael principalis et Dagnanus et Petrus fideiussores contra et preter tamen formam dicte apodixie et instrumentorum.

---

<sup>1</sup> Beginning of third column.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviation for *er* crossed out and replaced by abbreviation for *pre*.

<sup>3</sup> Abbreviation for *er* crossed out and replaced by abbreviation for *pre*.

<sup>4</sup> *com* crossed out at the beginning of *promisionem*



Et ex eo vel ob hec dictus Constantinus<sup>1</sup> substinuerit, substineat et substinet grande dampnum detrimentum et interesse et in posterum putat seu dubitat plus sua interesse maiusque dampnum seu detrimentum substinere et sibi adventurum<sup>2</sup> ex eo quod dictus Raffael principalis seu dicti Dagnanus et Petrus fideiussores non solvunt, numarant<sup>3</sup>, tradunt<sup>4</sup>, preparant et amaonant dicti principalis seu fideiussores dictam quantitatem asperorum mille millium quadringentorum septuaginta sex millium argenti de Castamena nomine et ex causa predicta.

Idcirco dictus Constantinus, constitus in jure et in presentia dicti domini potestatis Peyre, volens consultum sibi fore et sibi prospicere super jure suo et sibi competenti et compectituro et consulte dampna interesse et expensas evitare et jus suum salvum fore et illesa ac intacta jura habere contra dictos Raffaelem et fideiussores infuturum ad cautellam ne dicti fideiussores valleant pretendere ignorantiam infuturum super premissis seu altero eorum et ut de jure sibi competenti et compectituro valleat et possit idem Constantinus experiri et jus suum consequi et habere tam contra dictum Raffaelem quam contra dictos Dagnanum et Petrum

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a sign here indicating that something should be inserted but there is nothing obvious to insert. The sign is similar to one on the first column of the manuscript but ther is no apparent way of connecting them.

<sup>2</sup> Beginning of fourth column.

<sup>3</sup> Thus in text for *numerant*

<sup>4</sup> Abbreviation for *per* crossed out and replaced by abbreviation for *pre*.

fideiussores et fideiussorio nomine ipsius suo loco et tempore et bona eorum et cuiuslibet ipsorum denunciatur<sup>1</sup> ac denunciatur et protestatur fuit contra et adversus dictos Dagnanum Spinullam et Petrum de Groto fideiussores et fideiussorio nomine dicti Raffaelis de omni dampno interesse quod substituerit, sustineat et sustinet dictus Constantinus ex eo quia dictus Raffael sive fideiussores sui non solvit, numeravit, tradidit, preparavit, amonavit dicto Constantino dictam quantitatem asperorum mille millium quadringentorum septuaginta sexmillium argenti seu non solverunt, numeraverunt, tradiderunt, preparaverunt<sup>2</sup>, amonaverunt iuxta contentorum in dictis apodixia et instrumentis et de omni dampno, interesse et expensis quod et quas dictus Constantinus infuturum substituerit, subierit et passus fuerit ac subtubuerit nomine et ex causa promissorum et cuiuslibet eorum non actendorum, observatorum et adimpletorum tam in toto quam in parte et qualibet parte quantecumque quantitatis fuerit offerens seperatum recipere residuum dicte quantitatis asperorum sub protestacione tamen promissa adictis Dagnano et Petro fideiussoribus et fideiussorio nomine dicti Raffaelis seu ab alio seu alliis nomine eorum seu dicti Raffaelis protestans per eum non

---

<sup>1</sup> *Actum Peyre ad staciam ubi jus reditur per dictum dominum potestatem Peyre, anno dominice nativitate MCCCLXXXX, indicione XII secundum cursum Janue, die XI Januarii in vespere. Presentibus testibus, Bartolomeo Villanucio notario, Paulo de Valegia de Rapallo et Lodisio Carpeneto notario civitatis Peyre, vocatis et rogatis is crossed out here. It is almost word for word the same as the paragraph at the end of the document. Beginning of fifth column.*

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviation for per crossed out and replaced by abbreviation for pre.

stare contra dictos fideiussores et dicto nomine quominus predicta fiant proptestans eciam idem Constantinus contra dictos fideiussores in dicto nomine quod est recessurus de Peyra causa eundi<sup>1</sup> et dirigendi gressus suos versus dictum locum Castamene et dictum dominum Solemam Bassa infra terciam diem proxime venturam de quibus omnibus et singulis ex nunc pro ut ex tunc et ex tunc pro ut ex nunc solempniter proptestatur et de quolibet jure suo contra dictum Raffaelem principalem et dictos Dagnanum et Petrum fideiussores et fideiussorio nomine ipsius Raffaelis.

Et de predictis dictus Constantinus rogavit me notarium infrascriptum, ut inde conficere debeam presens publicum instrumentum in testimonium premissorum.

2

Actum Peyre ad staciam ubi jus reditur per dictum dominum potestatem Peyre, anno dominice nativitate MCCCLXXXX, indicione XII secundum cursum Janue, die XI Januarii in vespers. Presentibus testibus, Bartolomeo Villanucio, notario, Paullo de Vallegia de Rapallo, milite prefacti domini Potestatis et Lodisio Carpeneto, notario, vocatis et rogatis.

---

<sup>1</sup> beginning of sixth column.

<sup>2</sup> *Qau Dagnanus et Petrus fidemissores utsupra et dicto fidemssorio nomine dicti Raffaelis audictis predictis ipsi protestacioni et contentis in ea non consentiunt nisi si et in quamtum faciat pro eis dicto fidemssorio nomine et non aliter nec alio modo* is crossed out. The paragraph is re written at the end of the document.

Ea die in continenti

dicti Dagnanus et Petrus fideiussores utsupra et dicto fideiussorio nomine dicti Raffaelis audictis predictis ipsi protestacioni et contentis in ea non consentiunt nisi si et in quantum faciat pro eis dicto fideiussorio nomine et non aliter nec alio modo.

### Summary

The following four documents form a series dealing with relations between the *capitaneus* and the *subaşı* of Izmir involving Chios and the Hospitallers. Antonio Leardo was sent by the Podestà of Chios to Izmir to organise the release of two sons of the *subaşı*, captured by the *capitaneus*, and to negotiate a peace between the *capitaneus* and the *subaşı*. A seven-year peace was arranged and signed. As a guarantee of abiding by the treaty, the *subaşı* paid 10,000 gold *ducats* which he handed over to Antonio for depositing with the government in Chios. The deposit, in the form of gold money, pearls, jewels and other goods, was loaded onto the galley of the Hospitaller, Domenico de Alamania, the Hospitaller, for shipment to Chios. Antonius acted as guarantor for the *subaşı*, pledging himself as surety for him to Domenico for 2 000 gold *ducats*. If the *subaşı* or any other Turk contravened the agreement, the *capitaneus* had redress against Antonio, and the Lord of Mitylene. If the *subaşı* broke the treaty, Antonio was to pay 2,000 *ducats* to Domenico, and send a galley from Chios to the *capitaneus*'s aid. If the *capitaneus*

did not observe the agreement, then Antonio and the Lord of Mitylene had redress against Domenico. Antonio set off for Chios on the galley of Domenico together with the subaşı's deposit. But, at Old Phokaea he received letters from the Podestà telling him that they would not accept the deposit in Chios. Antonio opposed to this decision saying that it would damage Chios in the future, but without success. The deposit, on the authority of the subaşı was handed back by Antonio to Domenico to be returned. Domenico acknowledged receipt of the deposit in the condition in which Antonio had received it from the subaşı and promised to hand it over to Antonio or the subaşı or any legitimate person on request.

4. 1394.ix.1 = ASG Notaio Donato di Clavaro, Sc.39, filze 1, doc.169 (170)

In nomine domini amen. Dominus Antonius Justinianus de Roca, sciens et cognoscens se destinatum fuisse per dominum potestatem, gubernatores et consilium ad dominum capitaneum Smirarum <sup>1</sup> pro relaxacione duorum filiorum domini subasi Smirarum, captorum et arestatorum per ipsum dominum capitaneum Smirarum, et similiter pro pace tractanda inter prefactos dominos capitaneum et subassi Smirarum ac dictam pacem et concordium inter eos firmasse in qua continetur quod dominus subasi Smirarum pro observatione dicte pacis duratura annos septem proxime venturos tenetur deponere ducatos decem

---

<sup>1</sup> *et ad dnm* crossed out.

millia <sup>1</sup> auri sive valumentum eorum, et similiter dictum dominum subasi requivisse ipso domino Antonio depositum predictum fieri et esse debere penes dominacionem Syi pro ut idem dominus subassi per suas literas scribit dictis domino potestati gubernatoribus et et<sup>2</sup> consilio similiter sciens <sup>3</sup> valorem dictorum ducatorum decem millium deponendorum ut supra per dictum dominum subassi depositum fuisse penes dictum dominum Antonium pro ipsis consignandis dominacioni Syi ut supra, et dictum depositum oneratum fuisse in galea Reverendi in Christo Patris domini fratris Domenici de Alamania et conductum in Syo pro ipso deponendo penes dominacionem Syi ut supra. Et sciens similiter literas prefactorum domini potestatis, gubernatorum et consilii post recessum ipsius galee factum de Smiris cum dicto deposito super qua erat dictus dominus Antonius veniendo in Syo recepissee in<sup>4</sup> Folia Veteri in quibus continebatur ipsos deliberasse dictum depositum in Syo fieri non debere et actento propter deliberacionem predictam dampnum, interesse et expensas sequi posse ipsi domino Antonio et dominacioni Syi cum per ipsos dominum potestatem, gubernatores et consilium transmissus fuerit <sup>5</sup> pro predictis peragendis ut supra.

---

<sup>1</sup> *sive* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *sic* in manuscript.

<sup>3</sup> *dicto depo* crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> Beginning of second column.

<sup>5</sup> *ad* crossed out.

Idcirco constitutus in presentia mei notarii et testium infrascriptorum ad hoc specialiter vocatorum et rogatorum, proptestatus fuit et protestatur prefactis domino potestati dominis Lodisio et Bartholomeo Justinianis, gubernatoribus Danielli Justiniano, Domenico Justiniano de Garibaldo, Batiste Justiniano de Roca et Antonio Rondame Castellano, quatuor ex consiliariis prefacti domini potestatis, presentibus, audientibus et intelligentibus de omni suo dampno, interesse et expensis que et quas dictus dominus Antonius <sup>1</sup> pateretur seu substinent eo quia prefacti dominus potestas, gubernatores et consilium dictum depositum acceptare noluerunt sed ipsum dimisserunt ire in galea predicta. Protestans similiter quod ipse dominus Antonius non consensit dicte deliberationi nec consentit cum sibi vidiatur hoc preiudicare debere in posterum presenti insulle.

Et de predictis prefactus dominus Antonius rogavit me notarium infrascriptum ut inde confacere debeam presens publicum instrumentum in testimonium premissorum.

Et dictus dominus Bartholomeus, gubernator, <sup>2</sup> audiens predicta et volens respondere<sup>3</sup> predictis, dicit quod <sup>4</sup> per ipsos dominum potestatem, gubernatores et consilium non fuit deliberatum ipsum dominum Antonium transmitti debere ut supra

---

<sup>1</sup> *passis* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *pred* crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> Beginning of third column.

<sup>4</sup> *ipse dominus Antonius non fuit* crossed out.

sed ipse dominus Antonius sua voluntate propria accedit ergo ad predictam in aliquo non tenentur.

Et dictus dominus Lodisius gubernator respondit quod de electione ipsius domini Antonii nichil scit cum non erat presens ipsi electioni tamen ipsum dominum Antonium scripsisse per suas literas prefactis domino potestati, gubernatoribus et consilio de dicta depositione dicti depositi et quod ipse dominus Antonius expectare debebat responsionem eorum in Smiris quam non fecit quare in nichilo tenentur ad predicta.

Actum in Syo in aulla palatii domini potestatis Syi, anno dominice nativitatis MCCCLXXXVIII, indicione prima secundum cursum Janue, die prima Septembris in vespers, presentibus testibus Francisco Goardino et Silvestro de Bracelli, vocatis et rogatis.

5. 1394.ix.1 = ASG Notaio Donato di Clavro, Sc.39, filze 1, doc.170 (172)

In nomine domini amen. Reverendus in Christo <sup>1</sup> Pater Dominus Frater Domenicus de Alamania, Preceptor Neapolis et Avinonensis, sciens et cognoscens nobilem virum dominum Antonium Justinianum de Roca eidem obligatum esse <sup>2</sup> pro

---

<sup>1</sup> *pre* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *vigor* crossed out.



ducatis duobus milibus auri pro securitate et tanquam  
fidemissore <sup>1</sup> domini subassi Smirarum vigore et ex forma  
presenti instrumenti, paullo ante per me, notarium  
infrascriptum, confecti et nolens ipsum dominum Antonium pro  
predictis nec pro aliquibus contentis in dicto instrumento  
aliquod dampnum et incurrere posse preiudicium seu<sup>2</sup> gravamen  
dummodo <sup>3</sup> ipse dominus Antonius toto suo posse faciat si  
casus ad esset in recuperatione et exactione dictorum  
ducatorum duorum millium auri petendorum, exigendorum et  
recuperandorum a dicto domino subassi Smirarum <sup>4</sup> quitavit,  
liberavit et absoluit dictum dominum Antonium a dicta  
fidemissione sive debito dictorum ducatorum duorum millium  
contentorum in dicto instrumento per aceptillationem et  
acquilianam stipulato<sup>5</sup> solempniter introductis faciens eidem  
domino Antonio, presenti et stipulanti, <sup>6</sup> de predictis finem  
quitacionem, liberacionem et omni modam remisionem ac pactum  
de ulterius non petendo et promitte<n>s eidem domino Antonio,  
presenti et stipulanti, quod per ipsum Reverendum dominum  
fratrem Domenicum, heredes suos seu habentes vel habituros <sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *ip<s>ius* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *et* crossed out and *seu* added above the line.

<sup>3</sup> *per eum* crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> *pro ut est in dicto instumento cont<inent>ur* crossed out.

<sup>5</sup> *stipulato* inserted above the line.

<sup>6</sup> *f< >* crossed out.

<sup>7</sup> Beginning of the next column.

tamen ab eo dicto domino Antonio vel<sup>1</sup> heredibus suis aut in bonis suis nulla decetero de predictis seu aliqua parte predictorum non fiet nec movebitur lex quod actio, peticio, <sup>2</sup> requisicio seu conversia in iudice et extra de jure seu de facto. Renunciatio exceptioni presentis confessionis, promissionis<sup>3</sup> jure remissionis, quitacionis et liberationis non factarum rei sic ut supra et infra non esse vel sic non se habentis doli, mali, metus infactum actioni condicioni, secundum casua et omni jure.

Que omnia et singula supradicta prefactus Reverendus dominus frater Domenicus juravit ad sancta dei evangelia <sup>4</sup> corporaliter tactis scripturis et promisit et convenit dicto domino Antonio, presenti et stipulanti ut supra, proprio habere et tenere firma et rata et actendere, complere et observare et in nullo contrafacere vel venire aliqua ratione, occasione vel causa que diti vel excogitari possit de jure seu de facto, sub pene dupli to<tiu>s<sup>5</sup> eius de quo et quanto contrafient vel ut supra non observaretur tamen restitutis <sup>6</sup> etiam omnium aliorum dampnorum, interesse et expensarum que propterea fierunt literis et ex ratis manentibus supradictis

---

<sup>1</sup> *vel* inserted above the line.

<sup>2</sup> *seu* crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> *promissionis* inserted above the line.

<sup>4</sup> *et que* crossed out.

<sup>5</sup> The middle of the word is obliterated by a hole in the paper.

<sup>6</sup> *omnium all* crossed out.

et sub ypotheca et obligatione omnium bonorum prefacti  
reverendi domini fratris Domenici habitorum et habendorum.

Et voluit et mandavit prefactus reverendus dominus frater  
Domenicus instrumentum prediacte obligacionis <sup>1</sup> sive  
fideiussionis dictorum ducatorum duorum millium ut supra esse  
cassum, irritum et nullius valoris quantum pro facto dicit  
domini Antonii ut supra.

Actum in Syo sub logia ponderis Syi, anno dominice  
nativitatis MCCCCLXXXIIII, indicione prima secundum cursum  
Janue, die prima Setembris, post vespervas et ante  
completorium. Presentibus testibus, Raffaele de Ceronate,  
Pasqualino de Pontremillo, burgensibus Syi, et Nicolao Marcia  
de Diano, Cancellario dicti domini fratris Domenici, vocatis  
et rogatis.

6. 1394.ix.1 = ASG Notaio Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filze 1,  
doc.171.

In nomine domini amen. Nobilis vir dominus Anthonius  
Justinianus olim de Rocha sciens et cognoscens se destinatum  
fuisse ad dominum capitaneum Smirrarum et ad dominum subasi  
Smirrarum per egregium et nobiles viros, dominum podestatem  
Syi, gubernatores et consilium eiusdem, super relasacione  
duorum filiorum dicti domini subasi Smirrarum, captorum et

---

<sup>1</sup> *di* crossed out.

arestatorum per dictum dominum capitaneum Smirrarum, et pro pace inde inter eos tractanda<sup>1</sup> et observanda et actento quod inter dictos dominos capitaneum Smirrarum et subasi Smirrarum dicta pax de novo<sup>2</sup> fuerit confirmata <sup>3</sup> pro qua attendenda, complenda et observanda per annos septem pro<xime><sup>4</sup> venturos ipse dominus Antonius suprascriptis <sup>5</sup> reverendum in Christo Patrem <dominum> Fratrem Domenicum de Alamania preceptorem Neapolis et Avignonensis<sup>6</sup> proprium se obligaverit pro <sup>7</sup> ducatis duobus millibus auri <sup>8</sup> pro quibus fuit fideiussor prout est pro dicto domino <sup>9</sup> subasi Smirrarum suprascripto dictum dominum fratrem Domenicum proprium<sup>10</sup> tali videlicet quando quod <sup>11</sup> semper et quodcumque per dominum subasi Smirrarum vel per aliquem turchum turchum vel dominum in aliquo foret contrafactum sacramentis, promisionibus, pactis

---

<sup>1</sup> *tractanda* inserted above line.

<sup>2</sup> *dicta pax de novo* written down right hand margin.

<sup>3</sup> *de novo* crossed out and *di* written above line.

<sup>4</sup> Manuscript damaged here obliterating part of the word.

<sup>5</sup> *dicto domino capitaneo Smirrarum* crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> *reverendum in Christo Patrem <dominum> Fratrem Domenicum de Alamania preceptorem Neapolis et Avignonensis proprium* written above the line and down the right hand margin.

<sup>7</sup> *flor* crossed out.

<sup>8</sup> *prout in . . . . .* crossed out.

<sup>9</sup> *capitaneo* crossed out.

<sup>10</sup> *capitaneo Smirrarum* crossed out and *fratrem Domenicum proprium* written above.

<sup>11</sup> *dicti domini Antonii promissit et convenit* crossed out.

et conventionibus initis inter dictas partes quod tunc dominus capitaneus Smirrarum reversum habere debeat ad dominum subasi Smirrarum de contrafactis et si dictus dominus subasi Smirrarum <sup>1</sup> aptaverit et remediabitur in eis benequidam quod si contrarium fecerit teneatur dictus dominus capitaneus Smirrarum habere reversum ad magnificum dominum dominum Mitelini et dictum dominum Antonium qui teneantur et debeant super lamentacionibus et contra factionibus providere et taliter operare quod dictus dominus subasi Smirrarum faciet et observet que debet et tenetur vigore dictorum sacramentorum et compositionum ut supra quod si tunc dictus dominus subasi Smirrarum non fecerit dictus dominus Antonius dabit et soluit dicto domino fratri Domenico proprio<sup>2</sup> dictos ducatos duomilia auri et tunc operabitur quod galeam Syi parata<sup>3</sup> in subsidium dicti domini capitanei Smirrarum trasmittit<sup>4</sup> et voluit ipse dominus Antonius <sup>5</sup> actendus que ut supra <p ><sup>6</sup> promisit et convenit prefacto<sup>7</sup> reverendo <sup>8</sup> domino fratri Domenico de Alamania

---

<sup>1</sup> Beginning of next column.

<sup>2</sup> *capitaneo Smirrarum vel religioni hospitalis sancte Johannis Jherusalemiani Roddi* crossed out and *fratri Domenico proprio* written above.

<sup>3</sup> Abbreviation for *paratam* crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> *tunc operabitur quod galeam Syi parata in subsidium dicti domini capitanei Smirrarum trasmittit* inserted between two lines of the text and down the right hand margin.

<sup>5</sup> word crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> Part of word obliterated by a hole in the manuscript.

<sup>7</sup> *prefacto* inserted above the line.

<sup>8</sup> < > *in christo patri* crossed out.

proprio <sup>1</sup>, presenti stipulanti et recipienti, <sup>2</sup> sicut eidem domino fratri Domenico proprio<sup>3</sup> dare et solvere debere dictos ducatos duomillia auri ut supra ad liberam et nudam requisitionem ipsius dicti fratris Domencici proprii.

Renuncians exceptioni presentis confesionis et promisionis non facte rei sic ut supra et infra non esse vel sit non se habentis doli, mali metus infactum actioni condicioni secundum causa et omni jure.

Qua omnia et singula supradicta prefactus dominus Antonius juravit ad sancta dei evangelia corporaliter tactis scriptoris et promisit et convenit prefacto reverendo domino fratri <sup>4</sup> Domenico proprio<sup>5</sup>, presenti et stipulanti, actendere, complere et observare et contra in aliquo non facere vel venire aliqua ratione, occasione vel causa que dici vel excogitari possit de jure seu de facto, sub pena dupli totius eius de quo et quanto contrafieret vel ut supra non observarentur solempni stipulacione promissa cum restitutione etiam omnium aliorum dampnorum, interesse et expensarum que propterea fierent lictis etc. Rattis manentibus supradictis et sub ypotheca et obligatione omnium

---

<sup>1</sup> *preceptori Neapoli et Avinionensis* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *nomine et vice <dicti> domini capitanei Smirrarum* crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> *proprio* inserted above the line.

<sup>4</sup> *alioquam penam dupli* crossed out.

<sup>5</sup> *proprio* inserted above the line.

bonorum dicti domini Antonii habitorum et habendorum.

Acto quod pro predictis omnibus et singulis prefactis dominus Antonius realiter et personaliter conveniri possit capi et detineri hic Janue, partes Nicie, Neapole, Rodo, Peyre, Caffa, Famagoste et ubique alibi locorum et terrarum et sub quocumque iudice, officio et magistratis, ecclesiastico et civili, et ubi inventis, conventis seu requisitis fuerit ibi per pactum de predictis eidem reverendo domino fratri Domenico proprio<sup>1</sup> iure, stare, respondere, solvere<sup>2</sup> et satisfacionem facere, teneatur et promisit eidem ac si per inde presens contrattus ibidem fuisset celebratis abrogans in predictis fori privilegio non sui et non competentis inde legi si convenerit capitulo conventioni et omni alli juri.

Actum in Syo sub logia ponderis Syi, anno dominice nativitatis MCCCLXXXIIII, indicione prima secundum cursum Janue, die prima Septembris, post vespervas et ante completorium. Presentibus testibus, Symone Perollo de Vultero, Raffaele de Coronato, Pasqualino de Pontremullo, burgensibus Syi, fratre Angello de Perusio, priore Romano, fratre Antoniode Perusio, fratre Gonzallo de Eredia, fratre Artaldo de Valseris et Nicolo Macia de Diano, cancellario dicti domini fratri Domenici, vocatis et rogatis.

---

<sup>1</sup> *proprio* inserted above the line.

<sup>2</sup> *ubique* in margin.







7. 1394.ix.1 = ASG Notaio Donato de Clavaro, Sc.39, filze 1, doc.172 (173)

In nomine domini amen. Cum inter dominum capitaneum Smirrarum ex una parte et dominum subasi Smirrarum ex altera confirmata fuerint sacramenta composiciones et pacta aliarum inter ?ipothetica jurita et facta pro quibus observandis dictus dominus subasi Smirrarum deposuerit penes nobilem virum dominum Antonium Justinianum <sup>1</sup> ducatos decem milia auri sive valorem ipsorum videlicet in peccunia auri, perlis, jochalibus et alliis rebus pro ipsis deponendis penes dominacionem Syi sub cortis pactis videlicet ex tali modo contentis videlicet quod semper et quandocumque per unam ex dictis partibus fuerit contrafactum sacramentis pactis et conventionibus predictis quod altera pars reversum habere debeat ad dictam ?pronotam contrafacionem etc quod si tunc aptaverit per eam<sup>2</sup> et remediabitur in eis benequidam, et si <sup>3</sup> non adimpleverit tunc<sup>4</sup> teneatur habere reversum ad magnificum dominum Metelini et dictum dominum Antonium qui teneantur et debeant super lamentacionibus et contrafactionibus <sup>5</sup> providere et taliter operare quod per dictam partem contrafacientem observetur que debet et tenetur vigore

---

<sup>1</sup> *flor* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *per eam* inserted above the line.

<sup>3</sup> *g* crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> *tunc* inserted above the line.

<sup>5</sup> *pro <dictis>* written above the line and crossed out.

dictorum sacramentorum et compositionum ut supra quod si tunc non fecerit<sup>1</sup> dicta pignora dari et tradi debeant parte observante si vero per dominum capitaneum Smirrarum non observerentur que in dictis sacramentalibus continentur<sup>2</sup> quod tunc prefactus dominus Metelini et dictus dominus Antonius vel al<ius><sup>3</sup> ipsorum reversum habere debeant ad reverendum in Christo patrem<sup>4</sup> dominum fratrem Domenicum Alamania preceptorem Neapolis et Avenionensis<sup>5</sup> qui tunc teneatur facere observari per dominum capitaneum Smirrarum <sup>6</sup> ea in quibus ipse delinquit quod tunc et eo casu dictus dominus frater Domenicus teneatur restituere d<i>cta<sup>7</sup> pignora pecuniam etc et merces sive depositum ad manus dicte domini Antonii vel domini<sup>8</sup> subasi Smirrarum<sup>9</sup> et sciens ipse dominus

---

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviation for *fecerint* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> quod d< > et cognita per supradictos dominum Metilini et dominum Antonium crossed out and que in dictis sacramentalibus continentur written above.

<sup>3</sup> Part of the word is obliterated by the fold in the paper.

<sup>4</sup> *prefactum* crossed out and *reverendum in Christo patrem* written above.

<sup>5</sup> *Alamania preceptorem Neapolis et Avenionensis* is written at the bottom of the right hand column of the manuscript. It is not clear where it should be inserted, but here seems the most likely place.

<sup>6</sup> q< > *declarata et cognata fuerit per predictos* crossed out. Most of the first word is obliterated by a fold in the paper.

<sup>7</sup> Word partly obscured by fold in the paper.

<sup>8</sup> *domini* inserted above the line.

<sup>9</sup> *si vero per dominum capitaneum Smirrarum non observerentur que in dictis sacramentalibus continentur quod tunc prefactus dominus Metelini et dictus dominus Antonius vel al<ius> ipsorum reversum habere debeant ad reverendum in*

Antonius dictam depositionem peccunie et rerum ut supra captam non fuisse <sup>1</sup> per dominacionem Syi <sup>2</sup> nec ipsam dominacionem ipsum dictum depositum acceptasse sciens, quod eo casu se habere bayliam a dicto domino subasi Smirrarum <sup>3</sup> dictum depositum dandi et consignandi<sup>4</sup> dicto<sup>5</sup> reverendo in Christo patri domino fatri Domenico de Alamania <sup>6</sup> in proprio vigore lisani dicti domini subasi<sup>7</sup> et cognito quod dictum depositum sive peccunia etc et merces predictae delictae fuerint in sindicis in Syo super galeam ipsius domini fratris Domenici.

Et volens in observatione predictorum dictas ut supra peccuniam, jochalia et merces ut supra dare et tradere et

---

*Christo patrem dominum fratrem Domenicum Alamania preceptorem Neapolis et Avenionensis qui tunc teneatur facere observari per dominum capitaneum Smirrarum ea in quibus ipse delinquit quod tunc et eo casu dictus dominus frater Domenicus teneatur restituere dicta pignora peccuniam etc et merces sive depositum ad manum dicte domini Antonii vel domini subasi Smirrarum* is written at the bottom of the page with a mark for insertion into the text.

<sup>1</sup> Word crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *acceptatam* is inserted above the line and crossed out. the accompanying insertion mark is also deleted.

<sup>3</sup> Word crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> *et consignandi* is added at the end of the line.

<sup>5</sup> *dicto* added at the beginning of the line and *domino* crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> *preceptori Neapoli* crossed out. Beginning of new column. *et Avenionensis* crossed out at beginning of new column.

<sup>7</sup> *vigore lisani dicti domini subasi* inserted above the line. *Lisani* is the *nişan*, see Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p.241.

consignare dicto domino fratri Domenico proprio<sup>1</sup> in observatione predictorum. Id circo prefactus dominus frater Domenicus proprius<sup>2</sup> confesse fuit et in veritate recognovit prefacto domino Antonio Justiniano presenti, stipulanti et recipienti, se ab ipso habuisse et recepisse dictum depositum sive dictam peccuniam, jochalia etc et merces preciatas pro ipso deposito dictorum ducatorum decem millium ut supra eo modo et forma quibus dictus dominus Antonius cepit a dicto domino subasi Smirarum.

Renuncians exceptioni presentis confesionis et recognicionis non facte <sup>3</sup> peccunie, jocalium, rerum et mercium ut supra ext<unc><sup>4</sup> pro dicto deposito non habitis, non receptis et non<sup>5</sup> ?numerate rei sic ut supra et infra non esse vel sic non se habentis doli, mali, metus infactum actioni condicioni secundum causa omni jure.

Quas quantitates peccunie, rerum ,jocalium et mercium pro dicto deposito ut<sup>6</sup> ut supra dictus dominus frater Domenicus proprius promittit et convenit dicto domino Antonio, presenti

---

<sup>1</sup> *proprio* inserted above the line.

<sup>2</sup> *proprius* inserted above the line.

<sup>3</sup> *depositi predicti ut supra non habiti et [?] recepti* sive crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> Word partly obliterated by a hole in the paper.

<sup>5</sup> *non* inserted above the line.

<sup>6</sup> *pro dicto deposito ut* inserted above the line.

et stipulanti, <sup>1</sup> restituere et restitui facere ipsi domino Antonio sive prefato domino subasi Smirrarum vel legitime persone pro eis finitis annis quinque proxime pre venturis dummodo per dictas partes sibi ad invicem et vicisim fuerint observata sacramenta pacta et conventiones supradicta. <sup>2</sup>

Que omnia et singula supradicta<sup>3</sup> prefatus reverendus dominus frater Domenicus juravit ad sancta dei evangelia corporaliter tactis scripturis et promisit et convenit dicto domino Antonio, presenti et stipulanti, actendere, complere et observare et in nullo contrafacere vel venire aliqua ratione, occasione vel causa que dicti vel excogitari possit de jure seu de facto, sub pena dupli totius eius de quo et quanto contrafieret vel utsupra non observaretur cum restitutione etiam omnium aliorum dampnorum, interesse et expensarum que propterea fierent lictis et extra. Rattis manentibus supradictis, et sub ypotheca et obligatione omnium bonorum prefati reverendi domini fratris Domenici habitorum et habendorum.

Acto in presenti instrumento solempniter et convento quod pro predictis omnibus et singulis prefatus reverendus dominus frater Domenicus realiter et personaliter conveniri possit

---

<sup>1</sup> Several words crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> Beginning of a new column.

<sup>3</sup> *supradicta* inserted above the line. *dicte partes sibi ad invicem et vicisim iuraverunt ad sancta dei evangelia corporaliter tactis scripturis et promisserunt* et con crossed out.

capi et detineri hic Janue, Pise, Nicie, Neapoli, Rodo, Peyre, Caffa, Famagoste et ubique alibi locorum et ubique<sup>1</sup> et terrarum et sub quocumque iudice, officio et magistratu ecclesiastico et civili et ubi inventis, conventis seu requisitis fuerit ibi per pactum de predictis eidem domino Antonio sive procuratori suo juri stare, respondere solutionem et satisfactionem ac restitutionem de predictis<sup>2</sup> facere teneatur et promisit eidem ac si per inde pars <sup>3</sup> contractus ibidem fuisset celebratis abrenunciatis in predictis fo [?] privilegio non sui et non competentis iudicis legi si convenit capitulo convencioni et omni alii juri.

Actum in Syo sub logia ponderis Syi, anno dominice nativitatis MCCCLXXXIIII, indicione prima secundum cursum Ja<nue>, <d>ie<sup>4</sup> prima Septembris post vespere et ante completorium. Presentibus testibus, Symone Perello de Vultero, Raffaele de Coronato, Pasqualino de Pontremullo, burgensibus Syi, fratre Angello de Perusio, priore Rome, fratre Antonio de Perusio, fratre Gonzallo de Eredia, fratre Altaldo de Varseris et Nicolao Macia de Diano, cancellario dicti domini fratris Domenici, vocatis et rogatis.

---

<sup>1</sup> *ubique* added at the left hand of the line.

<sup>2</sup> *ac restitutionem de predictis* inserted above the line.

<sup>3</sup> Beginning of a new column.

<sup>4</sup> Some letters obliterated by a hole in the paper.

8. 1404.xii.31 = ASG Gregorio Panissario, Sc.37, flize 1, doc.49

### Summary

Elias Sacerdotus acknowledged that he had to hand over 13 capsas of mastic to Hacı Mustafa of Bursa.

### Text

In nomine domini amen. Elias Sacerdotus, Judeus, burgensis Chii, confessus fuit et in veritate publice recognovit Cagi Mostaffa Turcho de Bursia presenti, se eidem Cagi dare et <sup>1</sup> deberet capsas tresdecim masticorum centarium CCCllz, que capse sint et stent riscio, periculo et fortuna dicti Elie usque quo ipsas sibi consignaverit in Bergamo vel in Jasmati.

Actum Chii in curtilio palaci residentie domini potestatis Chii, anno dominice nativitatis MCCCCIIII, indicione XI secundum cursum Janue, die ultimo Decembris, paulo post vespervas. Testes vocati ad hec specialiter et rogati, Anthonius Bezacia, filius Janoti, Bartholomeus Cassina, quondam Raffaelis, notarius, et Baptistus Squarzaficus, <sup>2</sup> civis Janue.

9. 1404.xii.31 = ASG Notaio Gregorio Panissario, Sc.37, filze 1, doc.48

---

<sup>1</sup> solv crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> filius crossed out.



### Summary

Hacı Mustafa of Bursa acknowledged payment by Elias Sacerdotus for copper.

### Text

In nomine domini amen. Cagi Mostaffa Turchus de Bursia confessus fuit et in veritate publice recognovit Elie Sacerdoto, Judeo, presenti, se a dicto Elia habuisse et recepisse veram et integram rationem cum reliquata solutione et restitutione ac satisfatione integra totius quantitatis ramorum per dictum <sup>1</sup> Cagi usque in diem et horam presentes dicto Elie traditorum et consignatorum et totius eius cuius et de quo usque in diem et horam presentes dictus Cagi cum dicto Elia agere invicem habueret qualibet ratio ocassio vel causa.

Renuncians exceptioni presentis confessionis ut supra non facte, dictorumque ramorum vel ipsorum ratione non habitorum et<sup>2</sup> non receptorum ut supra, rei sic ut supra et infra non esse et sic non se habentis, doli, mali, metus infactum actioni, conditioni secundum causa et omni alii iuri. Quare dictus Cagi quitavit, liberavit et absolvit dictum Eliam presentem, heredes et bona sua a dictis et pro dictis ramis et omnibus et singulis contradicti Cagi et Elias hactenus invicem agere habuerit qualibet ratio, faciens Elie<sup>3</sup> finem

---

<sup>1</sup> *Elias* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> *et* inserted above line.

<sup>3</sup> *dicto* crossed out and *Elie* inserted above line.

quitationem, liberationem et remissionem omnimodam, ac pactum de ulterius non petendo < ><sup>1</sup> promittens dictus Cagi dicto Elie stipulati ut supra, quod per ipsum Cagi vel habentem seu habituros causam ab eo de et pro predictis omnibus nulla fiet unquam in iudicio vel extra contra dictum Eliam, heredes et bona sua requisitio, petitio seu actio aliqua movebitur, sed presentem quitacionem, liberacionem et absolucionem, et omnia et singula suprascripta habebit proprio et tenebit ratam, gratam et firmam, et rata, grata et firma, et contra in aliquo non faciet vel veniet per se vel interpositam personam aliqua ratio, occasio vel causa contraditi vel excogitari possit de jure vel de facto.

Sub pena dupli eius de quo confieret vel ut supra non observaretur stipulata solemniter et promissa cum restitutione omnium damnorum, interesse et expensarum litis et extra propterea fiendarum.<sup>2</sup>

Ratis semper manentibus omnibus et singulis suprascriptis et infrascriptis, et proinde et ad sic observandum dictus Cagi pignori obligavit omnia bona sua presentia et futura.

Actum Chii in curtilio palacii residentie egregii<sup>3</sup> domini

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a hole in the manuscript here but it seems that the missing word or words has or have been crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> Beginning of 2nd column.

<sup>3</sup> *egregii* inserted above the line.

..<sup>1</sup> potestatis civitatis et insule Chii, anno dominice  
nativitatis MCCCCIIIII, indicione XI secundum cursum Janue,  
die ultimo Decembris in vespers. Testes vocati ad hec  
specialiter et rogati, Anthonius Bezatia, filius Janoti,  
Bartholomeus Cassina, notarius, et Baptistus Squarzaficus,  
civis Janue.

10. 1413.i. = ASG Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1, f.104.<sup>2</sup>

#### Summary

Georgio, ambassador from Rhodes, offers the Podestà and  
others of Chios to intercede on their behalf with Paşa  
Turchus over their current war with Cüneyd, ruler of Aydın.

#### Text

MCCCCXIII < ><sup>3</sup> Januarii

Spectabilis dominus Potestas, domini Bernardus Paterius,  
Otobonus Justinianus, Baptistus de Rocha, Quilicus  
Justinianus, Franciscus et Johannes Justinianus de Campis  
considerantes et ad[vertentes] dominum Georgium ambaxiatorem  
de Roddo rogamento ipsorum se velle interponere con domino  
Bassa Turcho de guerra vigenti inter dominum Jonoiti Turchum

---

<sup>1</sup> Sic. in manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> It seem probable that this document was enacted in  
Chios as it is found together with others enacted there.

<sup>3</sup> The word or words here are obscured by a splodge of  
ink.



et ipsos dominos et ob ad fore dignum sibi domino Georgio quod videri de expensis digno premio ac in reditum ipsius de passagio con quo habiliter R<oddum><sup>1</sup> se transfer[e] possit nec minus advertentes] pro predictis ad dictum dominum Georgium transmissise <sup>2</sup> nobiles viros dominos Otobonum et Franciscum Justinianos qui parte ipsorum spectabilium dominorum potestatis et consiliariorum sibi promisserunt dum intendat de ipsa pace se ministeri et ad dictum Bassa se transferre ]<sup>3</sup> subvenire de expensis <dicto><sup>4</sup> premio et <sup>5</sup> passagio predictis, scientis ? et de foris factum, de sciencia et voluntate ipsorum promisserunt<sup>6</sup> et decreverunt autoritate <sup>7</sup> presentium predicta attendere<sup>8</sup> et adimplere ipsi nobili viro domino Georgio adveniento casu predicto.

11. 1413.viii.28 = ASG Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1, doc.255.

### Summary

Cagi (Kadı/Hacı) Sati oğlu (Satioğlu ?) Turchus, ambassador

---

<sup>1</sup> The word here is obscured by a splodge of ink.

<sup>2</sup> *dictum* crossed out in ms.

<sup>3</sup> This word is somewhat obscured by a hole in the ms.

<sup>4</sup> This word is somewhat obscured by a hole in the ms.

<sup>5</sup> ac crossed out in ms.

<sup>6</sup> The end of this word is obscured by an ink splodge.

<sup>7</sup> partium crossed out in ms.

<sup>8</sup> The word in the ms is *adttendere* with the *d* crossed out.

of Cüneyd, the ruler of Aydın, appeared before the Podestà of Chios with letters to the Podestà translated from Greek into Latin protesting over a court case involving Cagi Sorti (ie Kadı/Hacı ?) of Theologos, subject of Cüneyd. Cagi Sorti had a financial claim against the *fideicommissars* of the late Sorleone Salvaigo. He had however been unable to appear in Chios for the case and an adjournment for one year had been granted. Now, the year having elapsed, Cagi was still unable to attend and had heard that the Genoese authorities wanted the case heard not in Chios but in Genoa. This, the letter said, would be unjust/unlawful.

#### Text

In nomine domini amen. Anno domini MCCCCXIII die vigesima octava Augusti

Vir prudens Cagi Sati<sup>1</sup> ogli Turchus lugatus<sup>2</sup> et ambaxiator magnifici domini Joanit Turchi smirrarum domini etc. comparuit coram spectabili domino<sup>3</sup> Paulo de Montaldo, honorabili potestate et gubernatore civitatis et insulle Chii, literas tenoris infrascriptis [credencie] representans in literis grecis redatas in literis latinis<sup>4</sup> per me notarium

---

<sup>1</sup> The ms has *satiogli* with *ogli* crossed out and written separately.

<sup>2</sup> Thus in the ms, presumably for *legatus*.

<sup>3</sup> Followed in ms by *potestate et gubernatore* crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> *inter* crossed out.

infrascriptum retradente<sup>1</sup>.

Eidem egregio domino potestati et consillio eius quorum nomina sunt hec<sup>2</sup>.

Exponens pro parte prelibati domini domini Jonait quod skillicet quidam Cagi Sorti de Theologo subditus domini domini Jonait iam mensibus XVII incirca quandam causam habuit in curia Chii con fideicommissariis contra Sorleonis Salvaigi pro ducatis III in circa secundum quod patet in actis curie predictae, et quod huc usque dictus eius subditus non potuit expeditionem in dicta curia consequi < ><sup>3</sup> ymo dictis fideicommissariis data fuit per ollim dominum vicarium ollim dominum potestatis dillacio contra dictum Cagi ad probandum anni unius qui terminus elapsus est, et nichilominus non potest dictus Cagi suum jus consequi contra dictos fideicommissarios, nec expeditionem dicte cause haberi, ymo quod plus est sentit quod de civitate Janue emanavit quandam literam pro parte illustris domini Marchionis Montisferati capitanei Januensium etc. domino potestati predicto per quam jubet ipsi domino potestati ut jus administrare dicto Cagi non vellit nec cum in dicta causa audire, sed ymo ipsum transmutare ad audienciam magistratus civitatis Janue quod quedem iniuriose et cavilose.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is followed by a blank page, presumably for filling in later.

<sup>2</sup> This is followed by a blank page, presumably for filling in later.

<sup>3</sup> The word is obscured by a hole in the ms.

12. 1414.iii.18 = ASG Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze, 1  
doc.288

### Summary

Moyse de Meir was granted exemption by the Chian authorities for payment of taxes on grain and also on money either handed to or received from Cüneyd.

### Text

In nomine domini amen. Spectabilis dominus Paulus de Montaldo honorabilis potestas et gubernator civitatis et insule Chii. In presentia, auctoritate et consensu prudentium virorum dominorum Bernardi Paterii, Baptisti Justiniani de Campis, Johannis Justiniani de Garibaldo, Octoboni Justiniani, Gabrieli Justiniani olim Recaneli, Ambrosii Justiniani de Banca<sup>1</sup>, Quilici Justiniani olim de Furneto, Francischi Justiniani<sup>2</sup> olim de Furneto et Johannis Justiniani olim de Campis. Et ipsi prudentes domini consiliarii in presentia, auctoritate, voluntate et consensu prefacti spectabilis domini potestatis, existentes in sala palatii residence ipsius prefacti<sup>3</sup> spectabilis domini potestatis, ubi consilia solita sunt et librari. Advertentes et certam scientiam habentes iam per dictum Anthonium Marruffum olim potestatum Chii et eiusdem consilium magistrum

---

<sup>1</sup> word crossed out in Ms. after *Banca*.

<sup>2</sup> *Justi* crossed out in the Ms.

<sup>3</sup> *spest* crossed out in Ms.



Moysem<sup>1</sup> de Meir, Judeum, fixicum, civem et habitatorem Chii, fuisse pluribus condignis rationibus et respectibus franchitum et liberatum a quibuscumque honeribus, gr<av>aminibus<sup>2</sup>, impositionibus et angariis<sup>3</sup>. Advertentes nec minus de presenti ortam esse controversiam super dicta franchixia qua vertitur in dubium utrum ipse magister Moyses teneatur et obligatus sit prestacionibus peccuniarum porectarum Jonayt bey Turcho et pro grano distributo per dominos oficiales provissionis presentis civitatis Chii. Scientes et advertentes nec minus esse intencionis ipsorum prefactorum spectabilis domini potestatis et dominorum consiliariorum quod idem magister Moyses penitus a dictis prestacionibus et aliis quibuscumque gravaminibus<sup>4</sup> de cetero imponendis totaliter liberetur et pro<sup>5</sup> excepto habeatur<sup>6</sup>. Id circo auctoritate presentis publici decreti proprio valituri dictum magistrum Moysem presentem et humiliter requirentem justis precedentibus causis, franchiverunt, liberaverunt et penitus a quibuscumque angariis, prestacionibus, mutuis, avariis realibus et personalibus acepcione grani predicti seu alio quo[vis] modo sibi imponendis et a contrabucione peccuniarum aliquarum sibi

---

<sup>1</sup> *Moyses*, thus in Ms.

<sup>2</sup> A hole in the Ms here obliterates some letters.

<sup>3</sup> *quibuscumque* crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> *gravaminibus* is written above the line.

<sup>5</sup> A few letters are crossed out here.

<sup>6</sup> *totaliter* to *habeatur* is written down the margin and it is not clear where it fits in. I think it should go in here.

quoquo modo de cetero imponendarum et sive ipse peccunie traderentur alicui domino Turcho sive de ipsis aliququaliter disponerentur absolverunt<sup>1</sup>. Decernentes auctoritate presenti franchixie et immunitatis fuisse et esse derogatum quibuscumque legibus, statutis previlegiis et decretis quibus contra predictam quis opponere velet seu intenderet ac omni alii juri quo caveretur<sup>2</sup> quod contra predictam responciari non potuisset seu posset. Mandantes quibuscumque officialibus, proviissionibus, partitoribus seu distributoribus sive grani sive peccuniarum sive aliorum onerum. Quatenus predictum magistrum Moysem de cetero<sup>3</sup> occassionibus predictis non molestent nec in hiis cum aliququaliter nominent ymo totaliter exclusum habeant et teneant sub pena solvendi de eorum proprio illas prestaciones, dacitas, soluciones et acepciones grani et peccuniarum<sup>4</sup> quas eidem imponeretur mandantes de predictis per me notarium et cancellarium infrascriptum ipsorum<sup>5</sup> prefactorum spectabilis domini potestatis et dominorum consiliariorum confit debere presentem publicum decretum<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Several lines crossed out here.

<sup>2</sup> *presentas predictas* crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> *occ* crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> *et peccuniarum* written above the line.

<sup>5</sup> *specta* crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> *Actum ut supra anno dominice nativitate millessimo quadringentessimo quarto indicione sexta secundum cursum Janue die decimo otavo Marcii.*

*Actum in civitate Chii videlicet in sala palacii residencie prefactorum spectabilis domini potestatis et dominorum consiliariorum ubi consilia solita sunt ac librari, anno dominice nativitatis millesimo quadrangentessimo decimo*

compressione sigilli ipsorum assueti ad robur premissorum<sup>1</sup>.

13. 1414.iv.2 = ASG Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1, doc.286.

### Summary

Case of arbitration over the sale of cotton involving Katib Paşa Turchus of Bergamo.

### Text

In nomine domini amen. Raffaelis Centurionus domini Johannis, civis Janue et Johannes Paterius civis Chii<sup>2</sup> tamquam factor Alamani<sup>3</sup> Sofiano de Foliis Veteribus necnon nomine et vice Catip Bassa Turchi de Bergamo pro quibus de rato habitus ad cautelam promixerunt subditis<sup>4</sup>

De et super omnibus littibus, questionibus, differentiis et<sup>5</sup> controverssiis vertentibus et verti sperantibus occasione<sup>6</sup> emptionis certorum cotonorum factis hoc anno per dictum

---

*quarto, indicione sexta secundum curssum Janue, die decima octava Marcii in terciis crossed out. Sala is written salalla in the Ms. with lla crossed out. dominorum is crossed out after prefactorum*

<sup>1</sup> *compressione sigilli ipsorum assueti ad robur premissorum* is inserted after *publicum decretum*.

<sup>2</sup> *de et super omnibus littibus questionibus differentiis* crossed out in ms.

<sup>3</sup> *so* crossed out in ms.

<sup>4</sup> There follows a large empty space in the ms.

<sup>5</sup> *contro* crossed out in ms.

<sup>6</sup> word crossed out here in ms.

Raffaelem a predictis Alamano et Chitipi<sup>1</sup>.

Sese compromisserunt plenum, largum, liberum et generalem  
compromissum facerunt in duos Enricum<sup>2</sup> Justinianum et  
Ugolinum de Vinaldis tamquam in eorum arbitros arbitratores  
et amicabiles compositores et caros amicos<sup>3</sup>

Dantes etc.<sup>4</sup>

Promitentes etc.<sup>5</sup>

Sub pena ducatorum viginti quinque auri duratarum<sup>6</sup> hinc ad  
festum pasce proxime venturum<sup>7</sup>

Sub etc.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> There follows an empty space in the ms.

<sup>2</sup> *Enricum* is written in ful and the abbreviation sign above *um* is crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> This is followed by a gap in the ms.

<sup>4</sup> These two words are written under each other in the left hand side of the page and followed by an empty space in the ms.

<sup>5</sup> These two words are written under each other in the left hand side of the page and followed by an empty space in the ms.

<sup>6</sup> *du[?]bus tribus* is crossed out here in the ms.

<sup>7</sup> This is written partly down the left hand side of the second page of this document and followed by an empty space in the ms.

<sup>8</sup> These two words are written under each other in the left hand side of the second page of this document and followed by an empty space in the ms.

Actum in civitate Chii videlicet ad bancham civem portum in  
barbachana murorum dicte civitate, anno dominice nativitatis  
M CCCCXIIII, indicione sexta secundum cursum Janue, die  
secondo Aprilis. Presentibus Johane de Serra, notor,<sup>1</sup>  
Benedeto de Plano, civibus Janue.

14. 1414.vii.16 = ASG Giovanni Balbi, Sc.46, filze 1,  
doc.311

### Summary

Sipahi Bayezid), son the the late Jhacsi, a Turk from cazali  
isich obasi (the small settlement of ? Ece Ovası),  
acknowledged to Giovanni Balbi, acting for Domenico  
Giustiniano, receipt of payment for grain, money and other  
goods which Bayazit had on any occasion sold to Domenico.

### Text

In nomine domini amen. Sapihi<sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup> Bayazit quondam Jhacsi<sup>4</sup>,  
Turchus de Cazali isich obasi<sup>5</sup> sponte et ex certa scientia  
et nulo juris vel facti ducto errore<sup>6</sup> fuit confessus et in  
veritate publice recognovit mihi notario infrascripto tamquam

---

<sup>1</sup> Jo crossed out in ms.

<sup>2</sup> ie Sipahi.

<sup>3</sup> Bayz crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> ie.

<sup>5</sup> ie. .... ovası.

<sup>6</sup> *sponte et ex certa scientia et nulo juris vel facti  
ducto errore* written above the line and down the right hand  
side of the margin.

publice persone officio publico<sup>1</sup> stipulanti et recipienti nomine et vice domini Domenichi Justiniani quondam Andrioli et habentum ab eo causam et per me eidem domino Domenicho licet absenti <sup>2</sup> se a dicto domino Domenicho habuisse et recepisse integram solucionem<sup>3</sup>, racionem et veram satisfacionem de omni eo et toto quidquid et quanto <sup>4</sup> ullo umquam tempore de bonis peccuniis grano specialiter et rebus ipsius Sapihi Bayaxit pervenerit ad manus gubernacionem seu virtutem ipsius domini Domenichi.

Renuncians exceptis presentis confessionis non fa<ctis><sup>5</sup> rei sic ut supra non esse, non fuisse et sic vel aliter non se habente dolli, mali, metus infactum actioni condicioni cum causa vel sine et omni alii juri. Quas volens facere que juris sunt et ipsum dominum Domenichum licet absentem agnoscere bonam fidem eundem dictum Domenichum verssus me notarium jam dictum ut supra stipulantem et recipientem nomine ipsius<sup>6</sup> quitavit, liberavit et absolvit de omni eo et toto quitquid et quanto ipse Sapihi Bayaxit a dicto domino Domenicho vel in bonis ipsius pettere vel requirere posset

---

<sup>1</sup> *publico* inserted above the line.

<sup>2</sup> *se* crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> *solucionem* inserted above the line.

<sup>4</sup> *dictus dominus dominus Domenicus* et dictus Sapihi Bayaxit \_\_\_\_ crossed out.

<sup>5</sup> Part of the word obliterated by a hole in the paper.

<sup>6</sup> *nomine ipsius* inserted above the line.

quavis raccione, occassione vel cause quo modo <sup>1</sup> aliquo vel ingenio diti seu excogitari possit.<sup>2</sup> Promittens mihi, notario infrascripto tamquam publice persone officio publico ut supra stipulanti et recipienti nomine et vice dicti domini Domenichi, per dicta omnia et singula attendere, complere et observare et in nichillo contrafacere vel venire aliqua racione, occassione vel cause que modo aliquo vel ingenio diti seu excogitari possit de jure seu de facto.

Sub pena dupli totius eiusdem quo et quanto contrafieret vel ut supra non obervaretur solempni stipulat[a], valata et in tanta quantitatis taxata <sup>3</sup> et conventa de comuni acordio et voluntate<sup>4</sup> ipsarum partium pro vero dampno et interesse et qua pena soluta vel non soluta nichilominus <sup>5</sup> rataficare remaneant omnia et singula supra et infrascripta. Et pro inde et ad sic observandum pignori obligavit omnia bona sua presencia et futura.

Acto quod predictis dictus<sup>6</sup> Sapihi Bayazit posit ubique locorum et terrarum conveniri <sup>7</sup> reali<ter> et specialiter

---

<sup>1</sup> *mo* crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> Beginning of a new column.

<sup>3</sup> *et quod* crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> *voluntatat* in manuscript with the second *ta* crossed out.

<sup>5</sup> *Et proinde etc* crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> *dictus* inserted above the line.

<sup>7</sup> *possit* crossed out.

proinde ac si presens contractus ibidem esset celebratus.

Actum in civitate Chii videlicet ad bancum civem ubi jura redduntur per spectabilem <dominum><sup>1</sup> potestatum Chii, situm in barbacana murorum dicti civitatis, anno dominice nativitatis millesimo quadringentesimo decimo quarto, indicione sexta secundum cursum Janue, die <sup>2</sup> sexta decima Jullii in vespers. Presentibus testibus, Galvaro de Levento, Bartholomeo de Portufino notario, Lanfranco Paterio, Micalli Verioti de Foliis veteribus Grecho, Bayrambey<sup>3</sup> Turcho de Smirris quondam Ezedim<sup>4</sup>, Elies<sup>5</sup> Turcho de Smirris quondam Tagdira et Cristoforo Picenino interprete civem Chii lingue turche ex parto interpretante ad instanciam dicti Sapihi Bayazit<sup>6</sup> de lingua turcha in latina, vocatis specialiter et rogatis

Johannes Balus, notarius

---

<sup>1</sup> Word obliterated by a hole in the paper.

<sup>2</sup> *qua* crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> ie Bayram Bey.

<sup>4</sup> ie İzzeddin.

<sup>5</sup> ie İlyas.

<sup>6</sup> *ad instanciam dicti Sapihi Bayazit* inserted above the line.



## APPENDIX TWO: GLOSSARY OF PLACE NAMES

<b>Alanya</b>	Alaiye, Candelor, Candelore, Korakesion, Caloronos
<b>Alaşehir</b>	Philadelphia
<b>Amasra:</b>	Samachi, Amastris, Samastri, Samastro
<b>Antalya</b>	Setalia, Attaleia, Attalia, Attaleia, Adalia, Satarea
<b>Asinkalesi</b>	Iasos, Lasso
<b>Balat</b>	Palatia, Milet
<b>Bergama</b>	Pergamon
<b>Çeşme</b>	Aerythrea
<b>Denizili</b>	Ladhik, Thingozlou, Laodikeai
<b>Eğriboz</b>	Ağriboz, Chalcis, Egripos, Euboea, Negroponte
<b>Erzincan</b>	Arsinga, Arzinga, Arzingaal
<b>Eski Liman</b>	Diaschilo
<b>Fetiye</b>	Makri, Meğri
<b>Finike</b>	Fine, Finica
<b>Foça</b>	Phokaea
<b>Gelibolu</b>	Gallipoli
<b>Giresun</b>	Chisenda, Kerasunt, Jursona
<b>Gümüşhane</b>	Argiron, Argyropolis
<b>İzmit:</b>	Nicomedia
<b>İznik:</b>	Nicaea
<b>İncir Liman</b>	Liminia
<b>Kadı Kalesi</b>	Anaea, Ania
<b>Kapı Dağ</b>	Cyzicus, Aydıncık, Cassico, Chisico
<b>Karahisar</b>	Colonna

<b>Kütahya</b>	Coltai, Cottai
<b>Milas</b>	Mylassa
<b>Samsun</b>	Simisso
<b>Sinop</b>	Sinopoli, Sozopolis
<b>Selçuk</b>	Ehpesos, Teologo, Altoluogo, Ayasoluk
<b>Setia</b>	Sithe
<b>Sivas</b>	Salvastro, Sebasteia, Savasco
<b>Tekirdağ</b>	Rodosto
<b>Ulubad</b>	Lupai, Lupaio, Lopadion, Ulek Abad

## ABBREVIATIONS

ASG:	<i>Archivio di Stato di Genova</i>
ASLSP	<i>Atti della Societa Ligure di Storia della Patria</i>
AST:	<i>Archivio di Stato di Torino</i>
ASV:	<i>Archivio di Stato di Venezia</i>
Belleten:	<i>Türk Tarih Kurumu, Belleten</i>
BSOAS:	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>
CFHB:	<i>Corpus Fontium Historiae</i>
EI2:	<i>Encyclopaedia of Islam</i> , (Leiden and Paris, 1960 sq.)
İA:	<i>İslam Ansiklopedisi, İslam aleml Coğrafya, Etnoğrafya ve Biyoğrafya Lugatı</i> , (Istanbul, 1940 sq.)
JEEH:	<i>Journal of European Economic History</i>
JESHO:	<i>Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient</i>
RIS:	<i>Rerum Italicarum Scriptores</i> , L A Muratori, ed, vols I - XXV, (Milan, 1723-51)
ROL:	<i>Revue de l'Orient Latin</i> , (Paris)
TOEM:	<i>Tarih Osmani Encumeni Mecmuası.</i>
:	Used in the references indicates a summary of a document
=	Used in the references indicates a complete document

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PUBLISHED PRIMARY SOURCES

- ABU'L FIDA: *Geographie d'Aboulféda*, M Rainaud and M Le Bon Mac Guckin de Slane, eds, (Paris, 1840)
- ACTA URBAN<sup>A.L. TAYLOR</sup>I V: *Acta Urban<sup>A.L. TAYLOR</sup>i V*, ed. (Rome, 1964)
- ANDRAEA NAUGERII, 'Historia Veneta', in *RIS*, vol 23:
- ANHEGGER AND İNALCIK, *Kanunname*: Dr Robert Anhegger and Dr Halil İnalçık, *Kanunname-i Sultani ber Muceb-i 'Örf-i 'Osmani II Mehmed ve II Bayezid devirlerine ait yasakname ve kanunnameler*, (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından XI. seri - No.5), (Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara, 1956)
- ARGENTI, Chios: Philip R Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese and their Administration of the island 1346-1566*, vol I-III, (CUP, 1958)
- AŞIKPAŞAZADE (Giese): *Die Altosmanische Chronik des 'Aşıkpaşazade*, ed. Fredrich Giese, (Leipzig, 1929, reprinted Osnabrük, 1972)
- AŞIKPAŞAZADE (Istanbul): *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, ed. Ali, (Istanbul, 1332)
- BADOER, *Libro: Il Libro dei Conti di Giacomo Badoer (Costantinopoli 1436-1440)* ed. Umberto Dorini and Tommaso Bertelè, (Il Nuovo Ramusio, volume terzo) (Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato, 1956)

- BARKER, J 'Miscellaneous Genoese Documents on the Levantine World of the Late Fourteenth and Early fifteenth Centuries' in *Byzantine Studies/ Etudes Byzantine* vol.37 (1979)
- BALARD, Micheal, *Notai Genovesi in Oltremare. Atti Rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto (31 Marzo-19 Iuglio 1305, 4 Genaio-12 Iuglio 1307), Giovanni de Rocha (3 Agosto 1308-14 Marzo 1310), (Collana Storica di Fonti e Studi 43), (Genoa, 1984)*
- BALARD et al, *Documents: Balard, M, Angeliki E Laiou, C Otten-Froux, Les Italiens à Byzance et presentation de Documents (publication de la Sorbonne, Serie Byzantina Sorbonensia - 6 centre de recherches d'histoire et de civilisation Byzantine) (Paris, 1987)*
- BASSANO: *Costumi et i Modi Particolari della Vita de'Turchi: ristampa fotomecanica dell'edizione originale - Roma, 1545, F Babinger, ed, (Monaco di Baviera, 1963)*
- IBN BATTUTA: Ibn Battuta, *Voyages d'ibn Batoutah, C Defremery and B R Sanguinetti, Vol II, (Paris, 1854).*
- BELGRANO, L T, 'Cinque Documenti Genovesi-Orientali', in *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria*, vol.XVII, (1885-1886), 221-251
- BELGRANO, 'Documenti': L T Belgrano, 'Documenti Riguardanti la Colonia Genovese di Pera' in *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria*, vol XIII (1877-84), 146fl.
- BELGRANO, L T, 'Seconde serie di documenti riguardanti la Colonia di Pera', in *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria*, vol.XIII, (1877-1884), 931-1004

- BELDICEANU, Actes: Nicoră Beldiceanu, *Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans les manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris I*, vols I-II, (Écoles Pratique des Hautes Études, VIe section), (Paris, the Hague, 1960-1964)
- BENVENUTO DE BRIXANO: *Benevenuto de Brixano, notaio in Candia (1301 - 1302)*, T Morozzo della Rocca, ed, (Fonti relativi alla sotria di Venezia, Archivi notarili), (Venice, 1950)
- BORLANDI, Franco *El Libro di Mercatantie et Usanze de' Paesi*, (Torino, 1936)
- BORLANDI, Saminiato de'Ricci: Antonio Borlandi, *Il Manuale di mercatura di Saminiato de'Ricci*, (Università di Genova, Fonti e Studi IV), (Genoa, 1963)
- BRATIANU, Actes: G I Bratianu, *Actes des notaires génois de Péra et de Caffa de la fin du treizième siècle (1281-1290)*, (Académie Roumaine, Etudes et Recherches II), (Bucharest, 1927)
- CASULA, Carta Reali Diplomatiche: Francesco C Casula, *Carte Reali Diplomatiche di Alfonso III il Benigno, Re d'Aragon Riguardanti l'Italia*, (Padua, 1970)
- CHALCOCONDYLES: *Historiarum Demonstrationes*, E Darkó, ed, (Budapest, 1922-1927)
- CHRYSOSTOMIDES, 'Caroldo': J Chrysostomides, 'Studies on the Chronicle of Caroldo, with special reference to the history of Byzantium from 1370 to 1377/ in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 35 (1969) 123-182
- CHRYSOSTOMIDES, J, *Manuel II Palaeologos Funeral Oration on*

- his Brother Theodore*, (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, XXVI), (Association for Byzantine Research, Thessaloniki, 1985)
- DAY, Douannes: John Day, *Les Douanes de Gênes 1376-1377* vols I-II, (Paris, 1963)
- DEI: *Benedetto Dei, La Cronica dell'anno 1400 all'anno 1500* ed. Roberto Barducci, preface Anthony Molho (1990)
- DENNIS, '1403': G T Dennis, *The Byzantine-Turkish Treaty of 1403* in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33, (1967)
- DENNIS, 'Three Reports': 'Three Reports from Crete on the Situation in Romania', *Studi Veneziani*, 12 (1970)
- DOEHAERD, Renée, *Les relations commerciales entre Gênes, la Belgique et l'Outremont d'après les archives notariales génoises aux XIIIe et XVe siècles*, vol.III, (Institut Historique Belge de Rome. Études d'Histoire Économique et Sociale Vol. II) (Bruxelles-Rome, 1941)
- DOEHAERD-KERREMANS, *Relations commerciales*: Renée Doehaerd, Ch Kerremans, *Les Relations Commerciales entres Gênes, la Belgique et l'Outremont d'après les archives notariales génoises, 1440-1440*, (Bruxelles-Rome, 1952)
- DUKAS (Bonn): *Historia Byzantina*, I Bekker, ed, (Bonn, 1843)
- DUKAS (Bucharest): *Ducae Historia Turcobyzantina (1341-1462)*, B Grecu, ed, (Bucharest, 1958)
- DUSTURNAMEI ENVERI: M Halil, *Dusturnamei Enveri*, I Istanbul, (1928) (Turk Tarih Encumeni Kulliyati, Adet 15.)
- DUSTURNAME MEDHAL: M Halil, *Dusturnamei Enveri Medhal*, (Istanbul, 1930) (Turk Tarih Encumeni Kulliyati, Adet 15.).

- DUSTURNAME** (Melikoff-Sayar): Melikoff-Sayar, I, *Le Destan d'Umur Pacha (Dusturname-i Enveri)* Text, translation et notes (Paris, 1954)
- DVL**: *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, G.THOMAS, ed, vols I-II, (Venice, 1890-99)
- ELEZOVIĆ**, Gliša *Turski Spomenici* vol. I, book 2, (Belgrade, 1952)
- FLEET**, 'Treaty': Kate Fleet, 'The Treaty of 1387 between Murad I and the Genoese', in *BSOAS*, Vol. LVI, part 1, (1993), 13-33
- FRESCOBALDI**: *Visit to the Holy Places of Egypt, Sinai, Palestine and Syria in 1384 by Frescobaldi, Gucci and Sigoli* Translated from the Italian by Fr. Theophilus Bellorini O.F.M. and Fr. Eugene Hoade O.F.M. with a preface and notes by Fr. Bellarmino Bagatti O.F.M., (Jerusalem, 1948)
- GIOFFRÈ** *Atti rogati in Chio*: D Gioffrè, 'Atti rogati in Chio nella seconda metà del XIV secolo', in *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome*, fasc.34 (1962), pp.319-404
- GÖKBİLGİN**, *Edirne ve Paşa Livası*: M Yayyib Gökbilgin, *XV-XVI Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livası, Vakıflar - Mülkler - Muktaalar*, (Istanbul, 1952)
- GREGORAS**: Nicephorus Gregoras, *Byzantina Historia*, L Schopen and I Bekker, eds, CSHB (1828-55)
- HAYEZ**, *Urbain V*: Michel Hayez, *Urbain V (1362-1370), lettres communes*, Vol.II, fasc.I-IV, (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome), (Paris, 1964-1972)



x Kourousses: St. I. Kourousses, Μελουήλ Γαβριήλ, Σίτα Μανθάνος  
Μητεροπολίτης ἑρέσου (1271/2 - 1355/60) (Athens, 1972)

IACOPO DE PROMONTORIO: Franz Babinger, *Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen Iacopo de Promontorio-de Campis über den Osmanenstaat um 1475* (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, Jahrgang 1956, Heft 8) (München, 1957)

İNALCIK, 'Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar': Halil İnalcık, 'Bursa I XV Asır Şanayi ve Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar' in *Belleten* vol 24, part 93, 1960, 45-102

IORGA, *Notices et Extraits*: N Iorga, 'Notes et extraits pour servir a l'histoire de croisades au XVe siecle: Comptes des colonies genoise de Caffa, Pera et de Famagusta', *ROL* IV, p.25 fl.

KANTAKUZENOS: Ioannes Kantakuzenos, *Historiarum libri IV*, L Schopen, ed, CSHB (1828-32)

x  
KREKIĆ *Dubrovnik*: B Krekić, *Dubrovnik (Raguse) et le Levant au Moyen-Age*, (Paris, The Hague, 1961)

\*  
LAMBERTO DI SAMBUCETO: C Desimoni, 'Actes passés à Famagouste de 1299 à 1301 par devant le notarie génois Lamberto di Sambuceto' in *Archives de l'Orient Latin* II, (Bruxelles, 1964)

LAMBERTO DI SAMBUCETO (Pavoni): Romeo Pavoni, *Notai Genovesi in Oltremare. Atti Rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto (Gennaio-Agosto 1302)*, (*Collana Storica di Fonti e Studi*), (Genoa, 1957)

LIAGRE-DE STURLER, *Relations commerciales*: Léone Liagre-de Sturler, *Les relations commerciales entres Gênes, la Belgique et l'Outremont d'après les archives notariales*

\* Kydones, *Pro subsidio lachinorum*: Demetrius Kydones, *Oratio pro subsidio lachinorum* ed. Migne, *Patrologica Graeca*, vol. 154, col. 961-1008

- gênoises (1320-1400) v. I-II, (Brussels-Rome, 1969)
- MARCHA DI MARCO BATTAGLI DA RIMINI: 'Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini (1212-1354)', ed. G Carducci -V Fiorini in *RIS* XVI/3 (Città di Castello, 1912)
- MARCO POLO, ed. Pauthier: *Le Livre de Marco Polo Citoyen de Venise Conseiller privé et Commissaire Impérial de Khoubilaï-Kaân rédigé en français sous sa dictée en 1298 par Rusticien de Pise*, M G Pauthier (ed), (Paris, 1865) M. de P. 1277
- MARCO POLO (Rugoff): *The Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Milton Rugoff, (Signet Classics, 1961)
- MARTIN DA CANAL: Martin da Canal, 'La Cronique des Veniciens' in *ASI* vol 8 (Florence, 1845) 268-707
- MAS LATRIE, L de 'Privilège Commercial accordé en 1320 à la République de Venise par un roi de Perse fausement attribué à un roi de Tunis' in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* vol.XXXI (1870) (Paris, 1871), pp.73-102
- MAS LATRIE, L de 'Privilège accordé par Héthoum 1er, Roi d'Arménie aux Vénetiens, en 1261' in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* vol.XXXI (1870) (Paris, 1871), pp.407-411.
- MASSA, 'Alcune Lettere': Paola Massa, 'Alcune Lettere Mercantile Toscane da Colonie Genovesi alla fine del Trecento' in *ASLSP* nuova serie XI, fasc.11, 1971, pp.345-359. MELIS, Frederigo, *Documenti per la Storia Economica dei Secoli XIII-XVI* (Florence, 1972)
- MIKLOSISCH, F and MÜLLER, J, *Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi*, vol. III, (Vienna, 1870)
- MOLLAT, G, *Lettres secrètes et curiales du Pape Grégoire*

- XI (1370-1378), (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Roma), 3 fascicules, (Paris, 1962-1965)
- MONUMENTA PELOPONNESICA: Monumenta Peloponnesica, J Chrysostomides, ed, (in Press)<sup>1</sup>
- MORROZA DELLA ROCCA, *Notizie*: R Morroza della Rocca, 'Notizie da Caffa', in *Studi in onore di A Fanfani*, (Milan, 1962), vol. III, pp.267-295
- MULLER, G, *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'Oriente cristiano e coi Turchi fino all'anno 1531*, (Florence, 1879)
- MUNTANER: R Muntaner, *L'expedició dels Catalans a Orient*, Lluís Nicolau d'Olwer, ed, (Els nostres clàssics, VII), (Barcelona, 1926)
- MUSSO, *Navigazione*: G G Musso, *Navigazione e commercio genovese con il Levante nei documenti dell'Archivio di Stato di Genova (secc.XIV-XV) con appendice documentaria a cura di Maria Silvia Jacopino*, (Rome, 1975)
- NEŞRI (Menzil Codex): Ğihannüma die altosmanische Chronik des Mevlana Mehemed Neschri ed. Franz Taeschner, (Leipzig, 1951)
- NEŞRI ((1949): *Kitabi-i Cihan-nüma*, ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Dr Mejmed A Köymen, v.I-II (Ankara, 1949, 1957)
- NICOLA DE BOATERIIS: Lombardo, Antonio (ed), *Nicola de Boateriis, Notaio in Famagosta e Venezia (1355-1365)* (Venezia, 1973) (Fonti per la Storia di Venezia sez.III Archivi Notarili)

---

<sup>1</sup> I should like to thank Miss Chrysostomides for allowing me to use documents from this forthcoming publication.

- NOIRET, *Documents*: H Noiret, *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la domination vénitienne en Crète de 1380 à 1485*, (Paris, 1892)
- PACHYMERES: George Pachymeres, De Michaelae et Andronico Palaeologis libri XIII, I. Bekker, ed, vols I-II, CSHB (Bonn, 1835)
- PANARETOS, *Cronicon Trapezuntinum*: Eustathii Metropolitae Thessalonicensis Opuscula accedunt Trapezuntinae Historiae Scriptores Panaretus et Evgenicus ed. T F Tafel, (Francofurti ad Moenum, 1832)
- PAVONI, Romeo, *Notai Genovesi in Oltremare. Atti rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto (6 Iuglio-27 Ottobre 1301)*, (Collana Storicadi Fonti e Studi 32), (Genoa, 1982)
- PEGOLOTTI: Fr Balducci Pegolotti, *La Pratica della Mercature*, A Evans, ed, (The Medieval Academy of America 24), (Cambridge, Mass., 1936)
- PIETRO PIZOLO: *Pietro Pizolo, notaio in Candia, vol I (1300)*, S Carbone, ed, (Fonti per la Storia di Venezia, Archivi notarili), (Venice, 1978)
- PILOTTI: *L'Égypte au Commencement du Quinzième Siècle d'après le Traité d'Emmanuel Piloti de Crète (Incipit 1420) avec une introduction et des notes par P-H Dopp*, (Cairo, 1950)
- PLANOUDÉS, *Epistulae*: Mamimi monachi Planudis epistolae, M Treu, ed, (Breslau, 1890)
- POLONIA: Valeria Polonio, *Notai Genovesi in Oltremare. Atti Rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto (3 Iuglio 1300-3*

\* Sanudo (Kuntsmann): Fr. Kuntsmann, Studien über Marino Sanudo den Älteren, "Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften" vol. VII (Munich, 1855) p. 497-819

Agosto 1301), (Collana Storica di Fonti e Studi 31),  
(Genoa, 1982)

RATTI VIDULICH, *Duca di Candia Bandi*: Paola Ratti Vidulich,  
*Duca di Candia Bandi (1313-1329)*, (Venice, 1965)

RATTI VIDULICH, *Duca di Candia, Quatenus*: Paola Ratti  
Vidulich, *Duca di Candia, Quatenus (1340-1350)*, (Venice,  
1976)

ROCCA, *Pesi e misure antiche di Genova e del Genovesato*,  
(Genoa, 1871)

SANUDO: J Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos, Marino Sanudo  
Torsello, Secreta Fidelium Crucis*, Vol.II, (Hanover,  
1611)

\*

SANTSCHI, *Regestes*: Elisabeth Santschi, *Regestes des arrêts  
civils et des Mémoires (1363-1399) des Archives du Duc  
de Crète*, (Bibliothèque de l'Institut Hellénique d'Etudes  
Byzantines et Post-byzantines de Venise 9), (Venice,  
1976)

SATHAS, II: Sathas, C.N., *Documents Inédits relatifs à  
l'Histoire de la Grèce au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1881)

SCHILTBERGER: *The Bondage and Travels of Johann  
Schiltberger, a Native of Bavaria, in Europe, Asia and  
Africa 1396-1427*, Commander J Buchan Telfer (translated  
and edited), (Hakluyt Society, 1879)

SCHREINER, P, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, vols I-III,  
(Vienna, 1975-79)

LUDOLPHUS DE SUDHEIM: 'De Itinere Terre Sancte', G A Neumann,  
ed, in *Archives de l'Orient Latin*, Vol.III, (Paris,  
1884)

- TAFEL-THOMAS, *Urkunden*: G L Fr Tafel - G M Thomas, *Urkunden zur Älteren Handels und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedik mit Besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante. vom Neunten bis zum Ausgang des Fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Vienna, 1857) (Fontes Rerum Austriacarum. Diplomataria et Acta. XIV Band) v. I-III (Vol. 3 = 1256-1299)
- THIRIET, *Deliberations*: F Thiriet, *Délibérations des Assemblées Vénitiennes concernant la Roumanie*, vols I-II, (Paris, the Hague, 1964)
- THIRIET, *Régestes*: F Thiriet, *Régestes des Délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie*, vols. I-III, (Paris, 1958-1961)
- THEOTOKES: Sp Theotokes, Ἱστορικὰ Κρητικὰ Ἑγγραφα ἠκδιδόμενα ἠκ τοῦ Ἀρχείου τῆς Βενετίας, Μνημεῖα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας, (Academy of Athens), vols I/2, II.1-2, (Athens, 1933-1937)
- AL-`UMARI: E Quatremère, 'Notice de l'ouvrage qui a pour titre Masalek alabsar fi memalek alamsar, Voyages des yeux dans les royaumes des différentes contrées (ms. arabe 583)', in *Notices et Extraits des mss. de la Bibliothèque du Roi* vol. XIII, pp. 334-381, (Paris, 1838)
- WILLIAM OF RUBRUCK: *The Mission of Friar William of Rubruck. His Journey to the Court of the Great Khan Mönke, 1253-1255*, Translated by Peter Jackson, Introduction, notes and appendices by Peter Jackson with David Morgan, (The Hakluyt Society, 1990)

UZUNÇARŞILI, I H, *Kitabeler* (Istanbul, 1347/1929)

ZIBALDONE DA CANAL: *Zibaldone da Canal, Manoscritto mercantile del sec.XIV, a cura di A Stussi con studi di F C Lane, Th E Marston, O Ore*, (Fonti per la Storia di Venezia, Fondi vari), (Venice, 1967)

ZUCCHELLO: *Morozzo della Rocca, Raimondo, Lettere di Mercanti a Pignol Zucchello (1336-1350)* (Venice, 1957)  
(Comitato per la Pubblicazione delle Fonti Relative alla Storia di venezia. Fonti per la Storia di Venezia. Sez.IV Archivi Privati)

#### SECONDARY WORKS

AHRWEILER, Hélène, 'L'Histoire et la Géographie de la Région de Smyrne entre les Deux Occupations Turques (1081-1317) particulièrement au XIIIe siècle' in *Travaux et Mémoires* I, (Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation Byzantines, Paris, 1965), pp.1-204

ÀGOSTON, Gábor, 'Ottoman Artillery and European Military Technology in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries', forthcoming in *Turcica*

AKIN, Aydın oğulları: H. Akın, *Aydın oğulları Tarihi hakkında bir Arastırma* (Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 60, Ankara, 1968).

ANTONIADIS-BIBICOU, Douanes: Hélène Antoniadis-Bibicou, *Recherches sur les douanes à Byzance. L'"octava", le "kommerkion" et les commerciares*, (Cahiers des Annales 20), (Paris, 1963)

- ARBEL, Benjamin, Bernard Hamilton, David Jacoby, eds, *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, (London, 1989)
- ARTUK, İbrahim, 'Early Ottoman Coins of Orhan Ghazi as Confirmation of his Sovereignty' in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History. Studies in Honor of George C Miles*, Dickran K Kouymjian (ed.), (American University of Beirut, 1974), pp.457-463
- ARTUK, İbrahim, 'Karesi-oğulları adına basılmış olan iki sikke' in *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi* vol. 33 (1980/81) (İstanbul, 1982), 283-289
- ARTUK, İbrahim, 'Murad'ın sikkelerine genel bir bakış 761-792 (1359-1389)' in *Belleten*, vol. 184 (1982), 787-793
- ASHTOR, E, 'L'artiglieria veneziana e il commercio di Levante' in *Armi e cultura nel Bresciano, 1420-1870*, (Ateneo di Brescia, Brescia, 1981)
- ASHTOR, E, *East-West Trade in the Medieval Mediterranean*, (Variorum Reprints, 1986)
- ASHTOR, E, 'L'exportation des textiles occidentaux dans le Proche Orient Musulman au bas Moyen Age (1370-1517)', in *Studi in Memoria di Frederigo Melis*, Vol.II, (Naples, 1978), 303-377
- ASHTOR, Métaux Précieux: Eliyahu Ashtor, *Les Métaux Précieux et la Balance des Payements du Proche-Orient à la Basse Époque* (Paris, 1971)
- ASHTOR, Eliyahu, 'Observations on Venetian Trade in the Levant in the XIVth century' in *JEEH* vol 5 (1976) 533-



- ASHTOR, 'Pagamento ': E Ashtor, 'Pagamento in contanti e baratto nel commercio italiano d'Oltremare (secoli XIV-XVI)', in *Storia d'Italia Annali 6: Economia naturale, Economia monetaria* (Turin, 1983), 363-396
- ASHTOR, 'Prix': E Ashtor, 'La recherche des prix dans l'Orient médiéval. Sources, Méthodes et Problèmes' in *Studia Islamica* V, 21 (1964), 101-144
- ASHTOR, *Social and Economic History*: E Ashtor, *A Social and Economic History of the Near East in the Middle Ages* (London, 1976)
- ASHTOR, Eliyahu, 'Underdevelopment in the Pre-Industrial Era. The Case of Declining Economies' in *JEEH* vol 7 (1978), 285-310
- ASHTOR, E, 'The Volume of Medieval Spice Trade' in *JEEH* 9 (1980), 753-763
- ASHTOR, 'Weights': E Ashtor, 'Levantine weights and standard Parcels: A Contribution to the Metrology of the Later Middle Ages' in *BSOAS* 445 (1982), 471-188.
- ATAN, Turhan, *Türk Gümrük Tarih I cilt Başlangıçtan Osmanlı Devletine kadar*, (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VII. Dixi-Sa 109), (Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara, 1990)
- BABINGER, Franz, *Mehmed the Conqueror and his Time*, translated by Ralph Manheim, edited and with a preface by William C Hickman, (Bollingen Series XCVI), (Princeton, 1978)
- BALARD, 'The Genoese in the Aegean (1204-1566)' in

*Mediterranean Historical Review*, vol.4 (June, 1989)

- BALARD, *Romanie Génoise*: Michel Balard, *La Romanie Génoise* (XIIe - début du XVe siècle) v. I-II, (Atti SLSP, n.s., v.XVIII (XCII) fasc.I; Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 235) (Genoa-Paris, 1978)
- BELDICEANU, *Recherche sur la ville Ottomane*: Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Irène, N Beldiceanu, *Deux villes de l'Anatolie Préottomane: Develi et Qarahisar d'après des documents inédits*, (Pais, 1973).
- BENDALL, S and Morrison, C, 'Un trésor de ducats d'imitation au nom d'Andrea Dandolo (1343-1354)' in *Revue Numismatique*, série 6, vol.XXI (1979), 176-193
- BERKTAY, Halil and Suraiya Faroqhi, eds, *New Approaches to State and Peasant in Ottoman History*, (London, 1992)
- BERTELÉ 'Iperpero bizantino': T Bertelé, 'L'iperpero bizantino dal 1261 al 1450' in *Rivista Italiana di numismatica e scienze affini* s.V vol.5/59, 1957
- BLAKE, Robert P, 'The Circulation of Silver in the Moslem East down to the Mongol .Epoch' in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 2 (1937) 291-328
- BRATIANU, 'Approvisionnement': G I Bratianu, 'La question de l'approvisionnement de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine et ottomane' in *Byzantion* vol 5 (1929-1930) 83-107
- BRATIANU, G I, 'Nouvelles Contributions à l'étude de l'approvisionnement de Constantinople sous les Paléologues et les empereurs Ottomans' in *Byzantion* vol 6 (1931) 641-656

- BRAUNSTEIN, Philippe, 'Le Commerce du fer à Venise au XVe siècle' in *Studi Veneziani*, vol.VIII, 1966, 267-302.
- BRYER, Anthony, Heath Lowry (eds), *Continuity and Change in late Byzantine and early Ottoman Society*, (Birmingham University and Dumbarton Oaks, 1986)
- BRYER, Anthony, 'The treatment of Byzantine Place Names' in *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 9 (Birmingham, 1984/5), 209-214
- BYRNE, Eugene H, *Genoese Shipping in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (The Medieval Academy of America, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1930)
- CAHEN, Claude, 'Douanes et Commerce dans les Ports Méditerranéens de l'Égypte Médiévale d'après le Minhâdj d'al-Makhzūmī' in *JESHO* vol 7 (1964), 217-314
- CAHEN, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*: Cl Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey, A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History c.1071-1330*, (London, 1968)
- CHRYSOSTOMIDES, 'Venetian Commercial Privileges': J Chrysostomides, 'Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi' in *Studi Veneziani* XII (1970), 267-356
- ÇIZAKÇA, Murat, 'Price history and the Bursa silk industry: a study in Ottoman industrial decline, 1550-1650' in İslamoğlu-İnan, Huri (ed) *The Ottoman Empire and the World-Economy* (Cambridge, 1987), pp.247- 261
- COOK, *Economic History: Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the rise of Islam to the present day* ed. M A Cook, (London, 1970)
- DAY, John, *The Medieval Market Economy*, (Oxford, 1987)

- DELİLBASI, Melek 'Ortaçağ'da Türk Hükümdarları tarafından Batılara Ahidnamelerle verilen imtiyazlara genel bir Bakış' in *Belleten* vol.XLVII no.185, January (Ocak) 1983, (Ankara, 1984), 95-103
- DELUMEAU, 'Alun': Jean Delumeau, '*L'alun de Rome XVe-XIXe siècle*, (Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études -VIe Section. Centre de Recherches Historiques. Ports-Routes-Trafics XIII) (S.E.V.P.E.N., 1962)
- DUFOURCQ, *L'Espagne catalane*: Ch E Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalane et le MaMaghrib aux XIIIe et XIVE siècles*, (Paris, 1966)
- DUFOURCQ, 'Prix et niveau': Ch E Dufourcq, 'Prix et niveau de vie dans les pays catalans et maghribins à la fin du XIIIe et au début du XIVE siècles' in *Le Moyen Age* 4e série, 20 (1965)
- EHRENKREUTZ, Andrew S, 'Monetary Aspects of Medieval Near Eastern Economic History' in Cook, *Economic History*,
- FAROQHI, 'Alum production': Suraiya Faroghi, 'Alum production and alum trade in the Ottoman Empire (about 1560-1830)' in WZKM 71 (Vienna, 1979). Also in Suraiya Faroghi *Peasants, Dervishes and Traders in the Ottoman Empire* (Variorum, 1986)
- FAROQHI, Suraiya *Peasants, Dervishes and Traders in the Ottoman Empire* (Variorum, 1986)
- FAORQHI, 'Production of Cotton': Suraiya Faroghi, 'Notes on the Production of Cotton and Cotton Cloth in XVith and XVIIith Century Anatolia' in *JEEH* vol 8 no.2 fall 1979, 405-417.

- FAROQHI, Suraiya, 'Rural Society in Anatolia and the Balkans during the sixteenth century, I' in *Turcica* vol.IX/1 1977, 161-195
- FOSS, Clive, *Ephesus after Antiquity: A late antique, Byzantine and Turkish City*, (CUP, 1979)
- FRANGAKIS-SYRETT, Elena, 'Implementation of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention on Izmir's Trade: European and Minority Merchants' in *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no.7, Spring 1992, pp.91-112
- GRENDI, Edoardo 'Genova alla metà del cinquecento: una politica del grano?' in *Quaderni Storici* (April, 1970) 106-160
- HEERS, 'Commercio': Jacques Heers, 'Il Commercio nel Mediterraneo alla fine del sec. XIV e nei primi anni del XV' in *Archivio Storico Italiano* vol 113, (1955), 157-209
- HEERS, J, *Le Livre de Comptes de G Picamiglio, homme d'affaires génois, 1456-9*, (École Pratique des hautes Études, VIe section, Centre de Recherches Historique - Affaires et gens d'affaires, 13), (Paris, 1959)
- HEERS, 'Commerce de l'alun': Heers, Marie-Louise 'Les Génois et le Commerce de l'alun à la fin du Moyen Age' in *Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale* vol 32 (1954) 31-53
- HELDMAN, Marilyn E 'A Chalice from Venice for Emperor Dawit of Ethiopia' in *BSOAS* vol 53 part 3 (1990) 442-445
- HEYD, *Histoire du Commerce: W Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant au Moyen-Âge*, v.I-II, (Amsterdam, 1967)

- HEYWOOD, Colin, 'The activities of the State Canon Foundry (tophane-i 'amire) at Istanbul in the early sixteenth century according to an unpublished Turkish source' in *Orijentalni Institut u Sarajevu*, vol. 30 (1980), pp.209-217
- HEYWOOD, Colin, 'Notes on the production of fifteenth century Ottoman cannon', in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Islam and Science (Islamabad)*, (Islamabad, 1981)
- IMBER, Ottoman Empire: Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire 1300-1481*, (Istanbul, 1990)
- İNALCIK, H 'Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire' in *The Journal of European History* vol 19 (1969) 97-140 (and in *Variorum Reprints*), 97-140
- İNALCIK, 'The Ottoman Economic Mind and Aspects of the Ottoman Economy': H İncılık, 'The Ottoman Economic Mind and Aspects of the Ottoman Economy' in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the rise of Islam to the present day* ed. M A Cook, (London, 1970), pp. 207-218
- İNALCIK, H 'The Problem of the Relationship Between Byzantine and Ottoman Taxation' in *Akten des XI Internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongresses 1958* (Munich, 1960) 237-242
- İSLAMOĞLU-İNAN, Huri (ed) *The ottoman Empire and the World-Economy* (Cambridge, 1987)
- İSLAMOĞLU-İNAN, Huri and Çağlar Keyder, 'Agenda for Ottoman history' in İslamoğlu-İnan, Huri (ed) *The Ottoman*

- Empire and the World-Economy* (Cambridge, 1987), pp.42-62
- İSLAMOĞLU-İNAN, 'State and peasants': Huri İslamoğlu-İnan, 'State and peasants in the Ottoman Empire: a study of peasant economy in north-central Anatolia during the sixteenth century' in *The Ottoman Empire and the World-Economy*, ed. Huri İslamoğlu-İnan, (Cambridge, 1987)
- JACOBY, David, 'L'alun et la Crête Vénitienne' in *Byzantine Forschungen* (Amsterdam, 1987) vol. XII, pp.129-142
- KARABACEK, J, 'Gigliato des jonischen Turkomanenfürsten Omar-beg' in *Numismatische Zeitschrift* (1870) Bd.2.
- KARABACEK, J, 'Gigliato des karischen Turkomanenfürsten Urchan-beg' in *Numismatische Zeitschrift* (1877) Bd.9
- KARPOV, Sergej Pavlovič, *L'Impero di Trebisonda Venezia Genova e Roma 1204-1461. Rapporti politici, diplomatici e commerciali* (Rome, 1986)
- KEDAR, Benjamin Z, *Merchants in Crisis. Genoese and Venetian Men of Affairs in the Fourteenth-Century Depression* (Yale University Press, 1967)
- KIEPERT, Heinrich, *Über Pegolotti's vorderasiatisches Itinerar Monatsberichte der K. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1881), pp.901-913
- KOMROFF, Manuel, *Contemporaries of Marco Polo* (New York, 1928)
- KÖPRÜLÜ, M Fuad, *Alcune osservazioni intorno all'influenza delle istituzioni bizantine sulle istituzioni ottomane* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto per l'oriente, Nr.50) (Rome, 1953)
- KÖYMEN, Mehmet Altay 'Türkiye Selçukluları Devleti'nin

- Ekonomik Politikası' in *Belleten* vol.L no.198 December 1986, pp.613-620
- KREKIĆ, Bariša, *Dubrovnik in the 14th and 15th centuries: A City between East and West* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1972)
- LAIΟΥ, Angeliki E, *Constantinople and the Latins. The Foreign Policy of Andronikos II 1282-1328* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972)
- LAIΟΥ, 'Provisioning': A Laiou, 'The provisioning of Constantinople during winter 1306-1307' in *Byzantion* vol 37 (1967) 91-113
- LAMBROS, P, 'Monnaie inédite de Sarukhan émir d'Ionie, frappée à Ephèse (1299-1346)' in *Revue Numismatique*, nouvelle série, vol.14 (1869-1870), 335-343
- LEMERLE, P, *L'Emirat d'Aydin Byzance et l'Orient. Recherches sur 'La Geste d'Umur Pacha'* (Paris, 1957)
- LIAGRE, 'Commerce de l'alun': Léone Liagre, 'Le commerce de l'alun en Flandre au Moyen Age' in *Le Moyen Age* vol.LXI (1955), pp.177-206
- LOKKEGAARD, Frede, *Islamic Taxation in the Classic Period with special reference to circumstances in Iraq* (Copenhagen, 1950)
- LOPEZ, Miskimin, Udovitch, 'England to Egypt, 1350-1500': Robert Lopez, Harry Miskimin, Abraham Udovitch, 'England to Egypt, 1350-1500: Long-term Trends and Long-distance Trade' in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, M A Cook (ed), (London, 1970)
- LUTTRELL, 'Hospitallers': Anthony Luttrell, 'The



- Hospitallers of Rhodes confront the Turks: 1306-1421' in *Christians, Jews and Other Worlds. Patterns of Conflict and Accommodation* ed. Philip F Gallagher, (Lanham, New York, London, 1988)
- LUTTRELL, 'Intrigue': Anthony Luttrell, 'Intrigue, Schism, and Violence among the Hospitallers of Rhodes: 1377-1384' in *Speculum* vol.41 (1966), pp.30-48
- LUTTRELL, Anthony, 'The Latins and Life on the Smaller Aegean Islands, 1204-1453' in *Mediterranean Historical Review* vol.4 (June, 1989) no.1.
- LUTTRELL, 'Slavery at Rhodes': 'slavery at Rhodes: 1306-1440' in *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome*, fasc. 46-47 (1976-1977) 81-100
- MAS LATRIE, L de 'Des Relations Politiques et Commerciales de l'Asie Mineure avec l'Ile de Chypre sous le Règne des Princes de la Maison de Lusignan' in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* vol.II, 2nd series, (Paris, 1845-46), 120-142
- MAS LATRIE, L de 'Commerce d'Éphèse et de Milet au moyen age (Traité Vénétien de 1403 avec l'émir de Palatcha)' in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* vol.V, 5th series, (Paris, 1864), pp.219-231.
- MENAGE, V L, *Neshri's History of the Ottomans. The Sources and Development of the Text*, (London, 1964)
- ORIGO, Merchant of Prato: I Origo, *The Merchant of Prato, Francesco di Marco Datini*, (London, 1957)
- RAMSEY, W M, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* vol I *The Lycos Valley and South-western Phrygia* (Oxford, 1895), Vol II *West and West-Central Phrygia* (Oxford, 1895)
- RAMSEY, W M, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, (London,

1890)

ROMANI, Ruggerio 'A propos du commerce du blé dans la Méditerranée des XIVe et XVe siècles' in *Hommage à Lucien Febvre. Éventail de l'Histoire vivante offert par l'amitié d'Historiens, Linguistes, Géographes, Économistes, Sociologues, Ethnologues* (Paris, 1953), pp.149-161

SALTZMANN, Ariel, 'An Ancien Regime Revisited: 'Privitization' and Political Economy in the 18th century Ottoman Empire', forthcoming in *Politics and Society*

SCHLUMBERGER, G, *Numismatique de l'Orient Latin*, (Paris, 1878)

THIRIET, *Romanie Vénitienne*: Thiriet, Freddy, *La Romaine Vénitienne au Moyen Age. Le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII -XV siècles)* (Paris, 1975) TURAN, Osman *Orta Çağlarda Türkiye Kıbrıs Münasebetleri* in *Belleten* vol.XXVIII, no.109, January 1964, pp.209-227.

TURAN, Şerafettin, *Türkiye-İtalya İlişkileri I Selçuklar'dan Bizans'ın sona erişine*, (Istanbul, 1990)

ULUÇAY, C, *Saruhan oğulları ve eserlerine dair vesikalar*, Vols I-II, (Istanbul, 1940-1946)

UZUNÇARŞILI, I H, *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri*, (Ankara, 1988)

UZUNÇARŞILI, I H, 'Gazi Orhan Bey Vakfiyesi 724 Rebiülevvel - 1324 Mart' in *Belleten* V (July, 1941) 277-288

UZUNÇARŞILI, I H, 'Osmanlı Hükümdarı Çelebi Mehmed tarafından

★ Verlinden, 'Recrutement': Ch. Verlinden, 'Le recrutement des esclaves à Venise aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles' in *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome*, vol XXXIX (1968) 83-202

verilmiş bir temlikname ve Sasa Bey Ailesi' in *Belleten* III (October, 1939) 389-399

UZUNÇARŞILI, I H, 'Osmanlılarda ilk vezirlere dair mutaka' in *Belleten* III (January, 1939) 99-106

UZUNÇARŞLI, İsmail Hakkı 'Ondört ve onbeşinci asırlarda Anadolu Beyliklerinde Toprak ve Halk İdaresi' in *Belleten* Vol. II, 1938, 99-106

VARLIK, M C, *Germiyan-ogullari Tarihi (1300-1429)* (Ankara, 1974)

VERLINDEN, 'Crete': Ch Verlinden, 'La Crète, débouché et plaque tournante de la traite des esclaves aux XIVE et XVe siècles', in *Studi in onore di A Fanfani*, vol III, (Milan, 1962), pp.593-669

▲  
VISMARA, Giulio, *Bisanzio e l'Islam. Per la Storia dei Potenze Mussulmane* (Studi Urbinati di Scienze Giuridiche ed Economiche, N.S.A. N.1-2, 1948-49; 1949-50) (Milan, 1950)

VRYONIS, S, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, (Berkeley, 1971)

VRYONIS, Speros jr., 'Laonicus Chalcocondyles and the Ottoman Budget' in *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* VII (1976) 423-432

VRYONIS, 'Question of Byzantine Mines': S Vryonis, 'The Question of Byzantine Mines' in *Speculum* 37 (1962) 1-17

VRYONIS, Speros jr., *Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks and Ottomans* (Malibu, 1981)

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel, Hale Decdeli and Reşat Kasaba, *The incorporation of the Ottoman Empire into the world-*

- economy' in İslamoğlu-İnan, Huri (ed) *The Ottoman Empire and the World-Economy* (Cambridge, 1987), pp.88-97
- WANSBOROUGH, John, 'A Mamluk Commercial Treaty concluded with the Republic of Florence' in S M Stern, ed, *Documents from Islamic Chanceries* (Oxford, 1965), pp.39-79
- WATSON, Andrew M, 'Back to Gold - and Silver' in *Economic History Review* 2nd series vol 20 No.1 (1967) 1-24
- WITTEK, Mentese: P Wittek, *Menteşe Beyliği*, (Ankara, 1986)
- ZACHARIADOU, E A, 'Ertogrul Bey il Sovrano di Teologo (Efeso)' *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria*, N.S. V (LXXIX) (Genoa, 1965) 155-161
- ZACHARIADOU, Elizabeth, 'Holy War in the Aegean during the Fourteenth Century' in *Mediterranean Historical Review* vol 4 June 1989 no.1, 212-225
- ZACHARIADOU, 'Prix': E A Zachariadou, 'Prix et marchés des céréales en Roumanie (1343-1405)' in *Nuova Rivista Storica* LXI (Milan, 1977)
- ZACHARIADOU, *Trade and Crusade*: Elizabeth A Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade, Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin* (Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, No.11) (Venice, 1983)
- ZHUKOV, *Эгейские Эмираты*: К А Zhukov, *Эгейские Эмираты ВХІV - XV ВВ*, (Moscow, 1988)

## DICTIONARIES AND REFERENCE BOOKS

- ÇETİN, Atilla, *Başbakanlık Arşivi Kılavuzu*, (Istanbul, 1979)
- EDLER, Florence, *Glossary of Medieval Terms of Business. Italian Series 1200-1600*, (The Medieval Academy of America, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1934)
- LANE, Edward William, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, Book One, parts 1-7, (London and Edinburgh, 1863-1885)
- LATHAM, medieval Latin: R E Latham, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (London, 1975)
- LEWIS AND SHORT, *Latin Dictionary*: Charlton T Lewis, Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, (Oxford, 1907)
- LIDDELL, H G and R Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, (Oxford, 1940)
- MORAVCSIK, G, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. I-II, (Berlin, 1958)
- NIERMEYER, J F, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, (Leiden, 1976)
- ORBIS LATINUS: *Orbis Latinus. Lexikon lateinischer geographischer Namen des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, v.I-III, ed. Graesse, Benedicts, Pechl, (Braunschweig, 1972)
- PAKALIN, Mehmet Zeki, *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*, vols.I-III, (Istanbul, 1946-1956)
- PITCHER, *Historical Geography*: Donald Edgar Pitcher, *An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire*, (Leiden, 1972)
- REDHOUSE, Sir James W, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*,

- (Constantinople, 1890)
- SCHILBACH, Erich, *Byzantinische metrologie*, (Munich, 1970)
- SOUTER, Alexander, *A Glossary of later Latin to 600 AD*  
(Oxford, 1949)
- SPUFFORD, *Handbook*: Peter Spufford, *Handbook of Medieval Exchange*, (Offices of the Royal Historical Society, London, 1986)
- TARAMA SÖZLÜĞÜ, Vols I-VII, (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları - Sayı:212-212/7), (Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Ankara, 1963-1974)
- TOMMASEA E BELLINI, *Dizionario delle lingua Italiana* (Turin, 1929)
- TÜRKİYE'DE HALK AĞZINDAN DERLEME SÖZLÜĞÜ, vols.I-XII, (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları - Sayı:211-211/12), (Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Ankara, 1963-1982)